arXiv:1401.1784v2 [math.AC] 4 Dec 2014

ON THE SHAPE OF POSSIBLE COUNTEREXAMPLES TO THE JACOBIAN CONJECTURE

JORGE A. GUCCIONE, JUAN J. GUCCIONE, AND CHRISTIAN VALQUI

Abstract. We improve the algebraic methods of Abhyankar for the Jacobian Conjecture in dimension two and describe the shape of possible counterexamples. We give an elementary proof of the result of Heitmann in [7], which states that $\gcd(\deg(P), \deg(Q)) \geq 16$ for any counterexample (P, Q). We also prove that $\gcd(\deg(P), \deg(Q)) \neq 2p$ for any prime p and analyze thoroughly the case 16, adapting a reduction of degree technique introduced by Moh.

Introduction

Let K be a field of characteristic zero. The Jacobian Conjecture (JC) in dimension two, stated by Keller in [10], says that any pair of polynomials $P, Q \in L := K[x, y]$ with $[P, Q] := \partial_x P \partial_y Q - \partial_x Q \partial_y P \in K^\times$ defines an automorphism of $K[x, y]$.

In this paper we improve the algebraic methods of Abhyankar describing the shape of the support of possible counterexamples. We use elementary algebraic methods combined with basic discrete analytic geometry on the plane, i.e. on the points $\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ in the case of $L = K[x, y]$ and in $\frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0$ in the case of $L^{(l)} := K[x^{\pm\frac{1}{l}}, y]$.

The first improvement is a definition of the directions and an order relation on them, based on the crossed product of vectors, which simplifies substantively the treatment of consecutive directions associated with the Newton polygon of Jacobian pairs. It is related to [7, Lemma 1.15] and enables us to simplify substantially the treatment of the Newton polygon and its edges (compare with [2, 7.4.14]).

The second improvement lies in the use of the polynomial F with $[F, \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$, obtained in Theorem 2.6 for a given Jacobian pair (P, Q). This element can be traced back to 1975 in [8]. There also appears the element $G_0 \in K[P, Q]$, which becomes important in the proof of our Proposition 7.1. The polynomial F mentioned above is well known and used by many authors, see for example [8], [13] and [14, 10.2.8](together with [14, 10.2.17 i)]). In Theorem 2.6, we add some geometric statements on the shape of the supports, specially about the endpoints (called st and en) associated to an edge of the Newton Polygon. In [7, Proposition 1.3] some of these statements, presented in an algebraic form, can be found.

We will apply different endomorphisms in order to deform the support of a Jacobian pair. Opposed to most of the authors working in this area ([7], [15], [12]), we remain all the time in L (or $L^{(l)}$). In order to do this we use the following very simple expression of the change of the Jacobian under an endomorphism $\varphi\colon L \to L$ (or $L \to L^{(l)}$, or $L^{(l)} \to L^{(l)}$):

$$[\varphi(P), \varphi(Q)] = \varphi([P, Q])[\varphi(x), \varphi(y)].$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14R15; Secondary 13F20.

Key words and phrases. Jacobian Conjecture.

Jorge A. Guccione and Juan J. Guccione were supported by PIP 112-200801-00900 (CONICET).

Christian Valqui was supported by PUCP-DGI-2011-0206, PUCP-DGI-2012-0011 and Lucet 90-DAI-L005.

Another key ingredient is the concept of regular corners and its classification, which we present in Section 5. The geometric fact that certain edges can be cut above the diagonal, Proposition 5.16, was already known to Joseph and used in [8, Theorem 4.2], in order to prove the polarization theorem.

In Section 6 we give an elementary proof of a result of [7]: If

$$B := \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if the jacobian conjecture is true,} \\ \min\big(\gcd(v_{1,1}(P), v_{1,1}(Q))\big) & \text{if it is false, where } (P,Q) \text{ runs on the counterexamples,} \end{cases}$$

then $B \geq 16$. In spite of Heitmann's assertion "Nothing like this appears in the literature but results of this type are known by Abhyankar and Moh and are easily inferred from their published work", referring to his result, we do not know how to do this, and we did not find anything like this in the literature till now. For example, in the survey papers [2] and [3], this result is not mentioned, although in [3, Corollary 8.9] it is proven that $B \geq 9$.

In Section 7 we present our main new results: Propositions 7.1 and 7.3 and Corollaries 7.2 and 7.4. At first sight they look rather technical, but are related to the fact that for a Jacobian pair (P,Q) in $K[x,y]$ we know that P and Q are star symmetric. Propositions 7.1 and 7.3 yield partial star symmetries between elements in $K[P,Q]$ and P, whereas Corollaries 7.2 and 7.4 guarantee that the leading forms of P associated with certain directions can be written as powers of certain polynomials. This allows to establish a very strong divisibility criterion for the possible regular corners, Theorem 7.6, which enables us to prove that $B = 16$ or $B > 20$, a result that is consistent with [7, Theorem 2.24], where the two smallest possible corners are $(D,E) = (12,4)$ and $(D,E) = (15,6)$, and $D+E$ gives the gcd of the total degrees of P and Q.

We also prove that $B \neq 2p$ for all prime p. This result is announced to be proven by Abhyankar in a remark after [7, Theorem 1.16], and it is said that it can be proven similarly to [7, Proposition 2.21]. However, we could not translate the proof of [7, Proposition 2.21] to our setting nor modify it to give $B \neq 2p$. Once again in the survey articles [2] and [3], this result is not mentioned, although in [2, Lemma 6.1] it is proven that $\gcd(\deg(P), \deg(Q)) \neq p$. We also found [15, Theorem 4.12] from which $B \neq 2p$ follows. But the proof relies on [15, Lemma 4.10], which has a gap, since it claims without proof that $I_2 \subset \frac{1}{m}\Gamma(f_2)$, an assertion which cannot be proven to be true. The same article claims to have proven that $B > 16$, and the author claims to have verified that $B > 33$, but it relies on the same flawed argument, so $B \geq 16$ remains up to the moment the best lower limit for B.

One part of our strategy is described by [7]: "The underlying strategy is the minimal counterexample approach. We assume the Jacobian conjecture is false and derive properties which a minimal counterexample must satisfy. The ultimate goal is either a contradiction (proving the conjecture) or an actual counterexample." Actually this is the strategy followed by Moh in [12], who succeeded in proving that for a counterexample (P,Q), $\max(\deg(P), \deg(Q)) > 100$. The trouble of this strategy is that the number of equations and variables one has to solve in order to discard the possible counterexamples, grows rapidly, and the brute force approach with computers gives no conceptual progress, although it allows to increase the lower bound for $\max(\deg(P), \deg(Q))$.

The approach followed in [7] is more promising, since every possible B ruled out actually eliminates a whole infinite family of possible counterexamples and cannot be achieved by computer power. The possible counterexample at $B = 16$ is still within reach, and in Section 8 we give a very detailed description of its shape, after reducing the degrees, following essentially the same strategy of Moh in [12], who does it in the particular case $m = 3$, $n = 4$. This shows the advantage of the present method compared to [7], where the author says "we have no nice way to handle these cases", referring to the exceptional cases found by Moh.

Using the classification of regular corners we can produce the algebraic data corresponding to a resolution at infinity, and these data is strongly related to the shape of a possible counterexample. It would be interesting to describe thoroughly the relation between the algebraic and topological methods used in the different approaches mentioned above.

The results in the first six sections of this paper are analogous to the established for the one dimensional Dixmier conjecture in [6]. The first section is just a remainder of definitions and properties from [6]. In Section 2 we give an improved version of the analogous results in that paper, the main difference being the proof of the existence of G_0 in Theorem 2.6 and Proposition 2.10(5). In section 3 we recall some of the results of [6] about the order of directions. In section 4 we introduce the concept of a minimal pair in Definition 4.3 and prove that a minimal pair can be assumed to have a trapezoidal shape.

The results corresponding to Proposition 5.3 of [6] now are distributed along various propositions that classify regular corners in section 5. In section 6 we obtain the fact that $B \geq 16$, in the same way as the corresponding result in [6]. The rest of the results in this paper are new.

We point out that the proofs that $B = 16$ or $B > 20$ and that $B \neq 2p$ for any prime number p can be adapted easily to the case of the Dixmier conjecture.

1 Preliminaries

We recall some notations and properties from [6]. For each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the commutative K-algebra $L^{(l)}$, generated by variables $x^{\frac{1}{l}}$, $x^{\frac{-1}{l}}$ and y, subject to the relation $x^{\frac{1}{l}}x^{\frac{-1}{l}} = 1$. In other words $L^{(l)} := K[x^{\frac{1}{l}}, x^{\frac{-1}{l}}, y]$. Obviously, there is a canonical inclusion $L^{(l)} \subseteq L^{(h)}$, for each $l, h \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $l|h$. We define the set of directions by

$$\mathfrak{V} := \{(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \gcd(\rho, \sigma) = 1\}.$$

We also define

$$\mathfrak{V}_{\geq 0} := \{(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V} : \rho + \sigma \geq 0\},$$
$$\mathfrak{V}_{>0} := \{(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V} : \rho + \sigma > 0\}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{V}^0 := \{(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V} : \rho + \sigma > 0 \text{ and } \rho > 0\}.$$

Note that $\mathfrak{V}_{\geq 0} = \mathfrak{V}_{>0} \cup \{(1, -1), (-1, 1)\}$.

Definition 1.1. For all $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$ and $(i/l, j) \in \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ we write $v_{\rho,\sigma}(i/l, j) := \rho i/l + \sigma j$.

Definition 1.2. Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$. For $P = \sum a_{\frac{i}{l},j} x^{\frac{i}{l}} y^j \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\}$, we define:

- The *support* of P as $\mathrm{Supp}(P) := \left\{(i/l, j) : a_{\frac{i}{l},j} \neq 0\right\}$.
- The (ρ, σ)-*degree* of P as $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) := \max\left\{v_{\rho,\sigma}(i/l, j) : a_{\frac{i}{l},j} \neq 0\right\}$.
- The (ρ, σ)-*leading term* of P as $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) := \sum_{\{\rho\frac{i}{l} + \sigma j = v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)\}} a_{\frac{i}{l},j} x^{\frac{i}{l}} y^j$.

Remark 1.3. To abbreviate expressions we set $v_{\rho,\sigma}(0) := -\infty$ and $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(0) := 0$, for all $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$. Moreover, instead of $\mathrm{Supp}(P) = \{a\}$ we will write $\mathrm{Supp}(P) = a$.

Definition 1.4. We say that $P \in L^{(l)}$ is (ρ, σ)-*homogeneous* if $P = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$.

Definition 1.5. We assign to each direction its corresponding unit vector in S^1, and we define an *interval* in $\mathfrak{V}$ as the preimage under this map of an arc of S^1 that is not the whole circle. We consider each interval endowed with the order that increases counterclockwise.

For each $P \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\}$, we let $\mathrm{H}(P)$ denote the convex hull of the support of P. As it is well known, $\mathrm{H}(P)$ is a polygon, called the *Newton polygon of* P, and it is evident that each one of its edges is the convex hull of the support of $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$, where (ρ,σ) is orthogonal to the given edge and points outside of $\mathrm{H}(P)$.

Notation 1.6. Let $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}$ arbitrary. We let $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ and $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ denote the first and the last point that we find on $H(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))$ when we run counterclockwise along the boundary of $H(P)$. Note that these points coincide when $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ is a monomial[1].

The *cross product* of two vectors $A=(a_1,a_2)$ and $B=(b_1,b_2)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is $A\times B := \det\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ b_1 & b_2\end{smallmatrix}\right)$.

Remark 1.7. Note that if $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ is not a monomial, then $(\rho,\sigma)\times(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)-\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P))>0$[2].

Remark 1.8. If $(\rho_0,\sigma_0)<(\rho,\sigma)<(-\rho_0,-\sigma_0)$, then $v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P))\leq v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P))$, while if $(\rho_0,\sigma_0)>(\rho,\sigma)>(-\rho_0,-\sigma_0)$, then $v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P))\geq v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P))$, with equality in both cases only if $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ is a monomial. Moreover, in the first case

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{-\rho_0,-\sigma_0}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))).$$

Hence, if $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$, then

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{1,-1}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{-1,1}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))),$$

and, if $\rho+\sigma<0$, then

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{-1,1}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{1,-1}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))).$$

Remark 1.9. Let $P,Q\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$ and $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}$. The following assertions hold:

(1) $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(PQ)=\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$.
(2) If $P=\sum_i P_i$ and $\sum_i \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P_i)\neq 0$, then $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\sum_i \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P_i)$.
(3) $v_{\rho,\sigma}(PQ)=v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)+v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$.
(4) $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(PQ)=\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)+\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$.
(5) $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(PQ)=\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)+\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$.
(6) $-v_{-\rho,-\sigma}(P)\leq v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$.

We will use freely these facts along the article.

Notation 1.10. For $P,Q\in L^{(l)}$ we write $[P,Q]:=\det \mathrm{J}(P,Q)$, where $\mathrm{J}(P,Q)$ is the jacobian matrix of (P,Q).

Definition 1.11. Let $P,Q\in L^{(l)}$. We say that (P,Q) is a *Jacobian pair* if $[P,Q]\in K^{\times}$.

Remark 1.12. Let $P,Q\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$ and let $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}$. We have:

(1) If P and Q are (ρ,σ)-homogeneous, then $[P,Q]$ is also. If moreover $[P,Q]\neq 0$, then
$$v_{\rho,\sigma}([P,Q])=v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)+v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)-(\rho+\sigma).$$
(2) If $P=\sum_i P_i$ and $Q=\sum_j Q_j$ are the (ρ,σ)-homogeneous decompositions of P and Q, then the(ρ,σ)-homogeneous decomposition $[P,Q]=\sum_k [P,Q]_k$ is given by
$$[P,Q]_k=\sum_{i+j=k+\rho+\sigma}[P_i,Q_j]. \tag{1.1}$$
(3) If $[P,Q]=0$, then $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)]=0$.

Proposition 1.13. *Let $P, Q \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\}$ and $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$. We have*

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}([P,Q]) \leq v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) - (\rho+\sigma). \tag{1.2}$$

Moreover

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}([P,Q]) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) - (\rho+\sigma) \Longleftrightarrow [\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] \neq 0$$

and in this case $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}([P,Q])$.

Proof. It follows directly from the decomposition (1.1). □

Definition 1.14. We say that two vectors $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are *aligned* and write $A \sim B$, if $A \times B = 0$.

Remark 1.15. Note that the restriction of $\sim$ to $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is an equivalence relation. Note also that if $A \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $B \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $A \sim B$, then $B = \lambda A$ for some $\lambda \geq 0$.

2 Shape of Jacobian pairs

The results in this section appear in several papers, for instance [1], [7] and [8], but we need to establish them in a slightly different form, including the geometric information about the shape of the support.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$ and let $P, Q \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\}$ be two (ρ, σ)-homogeneous elements. Set $\tau := v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ and $\mu := v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$.*

(1) *If $\tau = \mu = 0$, then $[P,Q] = 0$.*

(2) *Assume that $[P,Q] = 0$ and $(\mu, \tau) \neq (0,0)$. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\gcd(m,n) = 1$ and $n\tau = m\mu$. Then*

   a) There exists $\alpha \in K^\times$ such that $P^n = \alpha Q^m$.

   b) There exist $R \in L^{(l)}$ and $\lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in K^\times$, such that

$$P = \lambda_P R^m \quad \text{and} \quad Q = \lambda_Q R^n. \tag{2.1}$$

   Moreover

   - *if $\mu\tau < 0$, then $P, Q \in K[x^{1/l}, x^{-1/l}]$,*
   - *if $\mu\tau \geq 0$, then we can choose $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,*
   - *if $P, Q \in L$, then $R \in L$.*

Proof. (1) If $\rho = 0$, then $P, Q \in K[x^{1/l}, x^{-1/l}]$ and if $\rho \neq 0$, then $P, Q \in K[z]$ where $z := x^{-\sigma/\rho} y$. In both cases, $[P,Q] = 0$ follows easily.

(2a) This is [8, Proposition 2.1(2)].

(2b) Assume first that $\mu\tau < 0$ and take $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ coprime with $n\tau = m\mu$. By statement (a), there exists $\alpha \in K^\times$ such that $P^n = \alpha Q^m$. Since $mn < 0$, necessarily $P, Q \in K[x^{1/l}, x^{-1/l}]$ and $\rho \neq 0$. Moreover, since P an Q are (ρ, σ)-homogeneous,

$$P = \lambda_P x^{\frac{r}{t}} \quad \text{and} \quad Q = \lambda_Q x^{\frac{u}{t}},$$

for some $\lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in K^\times$ and $r, u \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $rn = um$. Clearly $R := x^{\frac{r}{lm}} = x^{\frac{u}{ln}}$ satisfies (2.1). In order to finish the proof we only must note that, since m and n are coprime, $R \in L^{(l)}$.

Assume now $\mu\tau \geq 0$ and let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be such that $n\tau = m\mu$ and $\gcd(m,n) = 1$. Set

$$z := \begin{cases} x^{-\frac{\sigma}{\rho}} y & \text{if } \rho \neq 0, \\ x^{\frac{1}{t}} & \text{if } \rho = 0, \end{cases}$$

and write

$$P = x^{\frac{r}{l}} y^s f(z) \quad \text{and} \quad Q = x^{\frac{u}{l}} y^v g(z),$$

where $f, g \in K[z]$ with $f(0) \neq 0 \neq g(0)$. By statement (2a) there exists $\alpha \in K^\times$ such that

$$x^{\frac{nr}{l}} y^{ns} f^n(z) = P^n = \alpha Q^m = \alpha x^{\frac{mu}{l}} y^{mv} g^m(z),$$

from which we obtain

$$(nr/l, ns) = (mu/l, mv) \quad \text{and} \quad f^n = \alpha g^m.$$

Since $\gcd(m, n) = 1$, by the second equality there exist $h \in K[z]$ and $\lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in K^\times$ such that

$$f = \lambda_P h^m(z) \quad \text{and} \quad g = \lambda_Q h^n(z) \tag{2.2}$$

Take $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $cm + dn = 1$ and define $(a/l, b) := c(r/l, s) + d(u/l, v)$. Since

$$m(a/l, b) = (r/l, s) \quad \text{and} \quad n(a/l, b) = (u/l, v),$$

it follows from (2.2), that $R := x^{\frac{a}{l}} y^b h(z)$ satisfies (2.1), as desired.

Finally, if $P, Q \in L$, then $v_{-1,0}(R) = \frac{1}{m} v_{-1,0}(P) \leq 0$, which combined with the fact that $R \in L^{(1)}$ implies that $R \in L$. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$ and let $P, Q \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $[P, Q] \in K^\times$. If $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \neq 0$, then there exists $G_0 \in K[P, Q]$ such that*

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] \neq 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad [[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)], \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0.$$

Moreover, if we define recursively $G_i := [G_{i-1}, P]$, then $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_i), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0$ for $i \geq 1$.

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and set

$$M(t) := \operatorname{linspan}\{P^i Q^j : i, j = 0, \ldots, t\}.$$

Since $\{P^i Q^j\}$ is linearly independent, we have

$$\dim M(t) = (t + 1)^2. \tag{2.3}$$

On the other hand, a direct computation shows that

$$mt \leq -v_{-\rho,-\sigma}(z) \leq v_{\rho,\sigma}(z) \leq Mt \quad \text{for each } z \in M(t),$$

where

$$m := \min\{0, -v_{-\rho,-\sigma}(P), -v_{-\rho,-\sigma}(Q), -v_{-\rho,-\sigma}(P) - v_{-\rho,-\sigma}(Q)\}$$

and

$$M := \max\{0, v_{\rho,\sigma}(P), v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q), v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)\}.$$

Consequently,

$$J := v_{\rho,\sigma}(M(t) \setminus \{0\}) \subseteq \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z} \cap [mt, Mt].$$

For each $\beta \in J$ we take a $z_\beta \in M(t)$ with $v_{\rho,\sigma}(z_\beta) = \beta$. We first prove that there exist $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $H \in M(t)$, such that

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(H)] \neq 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Assume by contradiction that

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(H)] = 0 \qquad \text{for all } H \in M(t) \text{ and all } t \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We claim that then $M(t) = \operatorname{linspan}\{z_\beta : \beta \in J\}$. In fact, suppose this equality is false and take $z \in M(t) \setminus \operatorname{linspan}\{z_\beta : \beta \in J\}$ with $\beta := v_{\rho,\sigma}(z)$ minimum. By assumption

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(z)] = 0 = [\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(z_\beta)].$$

Since $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \neq 0$ and $v_{\rho,\sigma}(z) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(z_\beta)$, by Proposition 2.1(2b) there exist $R \in L^{(l)}$, $\lambda, \lambda_\beta \in K^\times$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(z) = \lambda R^n \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(z_\beta) = \lambda_\beta R^n.$$

Hence $v_{\rho,\sigma}(z - \lambda\lambda_\beta^{-1} z_\beta) < v_{\rho,\sigma}(z)$, which contradicts the choice of z, finishing the proof of the claim. Consequently $\dim M(t) \leq l(M-m)t$, which contradicts (2.3) if we take $t \geq l(M-m)$. Thus we can find $H \in K[P,Q]$ such that (2.4) is satisfied.

We now define recursively $(H_j)_{j\geq 0}$ by setting

$$H_0 := H, \quad \text{and} \quad H_{j+1} := [H_j, P].$$

Since $H_0 \in K[P,Q]$, eventually $H_n = 0$. Let k be the largest index for which $H_k \neq 0$. By Remark 1.12(3) we know that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(H_k), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0$. But we also have $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(H_0), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] \neq 0$ and hence there exists a largest j such that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(H_j), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] \neq 0$. By Proposition 1.13 we have

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(H_j), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(H_{j+1}),$$

and so $G_0 := H_j$ satisfies the required conditions. □

Proposition 2.3. *Let $P, Q \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\}$ and $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$. If $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = 0$, then*

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q).$$

Proof. Consider (ρ_0,σ_0) such that $(\rho_0,\sigma_0) < (\rho,\sigma) < (-\rho_0,\sigma_0)$. By Remark 1.12(3),

$$0 = [\ell_{(\rho_0,\sigma_0)}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)), \ell_{(\rho_0,\sigma_0)}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q))].$$

On the other hand, by Remark 1.8 there exist $\mu_P, \mu_Q \in K^\times$ such that

$$\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = \mu_P x^{\frac{r}{l}} y^s \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) = \mu_Q x^{\frac{u}{l}} y^v,$$

where $(r/l, s) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ and $(u/l, v) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$. Clearly

$$0 = [\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)), \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q))] = \mu_P\mu_Q \left(\frac{rv}{l} - \frac{us}{l}\right) x^{\frac{r+u}{l}-1} y^{s+v-1},$$

from which $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$ follows. Similar arguments yield $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$, finishing the proof. □

Proposition 2.4. *Let $P, Q, R \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\}$ be such that*

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(R), \text{ [3]}$$

where $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$. We have:

1. $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$ *if and only if* $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) - (1,1) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(R)$.
2. $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$ *if and only if* $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) - (1,1) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R)$.

Proof. (1) It is enough to prove it when P, Q and R are (ρ,σ)-homogeneous, so we will assume it. Choose $(\rho_0,\sigma_0) \in \mathfrak{V}$ such that $(\rho_0,\sigma_0) < (\rho,\sigma) < (-\rho_0,-\sigma_0)$. By Remark 1.8

$$\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P) = \mu_P x^{\frac{r}{l}} y^s, \quad \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q) = \mu_Q x^{\frac{u}{l}} y^v \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(R) = \mu_R x^{\frac{a}{l}} y^b, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$\mu_P, \mu_Q, \mu_R \in K^\times, \quad \left(\frac{r}{l}, s\right) := \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \quad \left(\frac{u}{l}, v\right) := \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{a}{l}, b\right) := \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(R).$$

Clearly

$$[\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P), \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q)] = \mu_P\mu_Q \left(\frac{rv}{l} - \frac{us}{l}\right) x^{\frac{r+u}{l}-1} y^{s+v-1}$$

and hence, by Proposition 1.13,

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) \iff [\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P), \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q)] \neq 0 \iff \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(R) = [\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P), \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q)]. \tag{2.6}$$

Consequently if $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$, then

$$\mu_R x^{\frac{a}{l}} y^b = \mu_P \mu_P \left(\frac{rv}{l} - \frac{us}{l}\right) x^{\frac{r+u}{l}-1} y^{s+v-1},$$

which evidently implies that

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) - (1,1) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(R).$$

Reciprocally if this last equation holds, then by (2.5)

$$v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P) + v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q) - (\rho_0 + \sigma_0) = v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(R),$$

and so, again by Proposition 1.13,

$$[\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P), \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q)] \neq 0,$$

which by (2.6) implies that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$.

(2) It is similar to the proof of statement (1). □

Remark 2.5. Let $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$ and let $P, F \in L^{(l)}$ be (ρ,σ)-homogeneous such that $[F,P] = P$. If F is a monomial, then $F = \lambda xy$ with $\lambda \in K^\times$, and, either $\rho + \sigma = 0$ or P is also a monomial[4].

Theorem 2.6. *Let $P \in L^{(l)}$ and let $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}_{>0}$ be such that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0$. If $[P,Q] \in K^\times$ for some $Q \in L^{(l)}$, then there exists $G_0 \in K[P,Q] \setminus \{0\}$ and a (ρ,σ)-homogeneous element $F \in L^{(l)}$ such that*

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \rho + \sigma, \quad [F, \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \quad \text{and} \quad [\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]F = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0)\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P). \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover, we have

(1) *If $P, Q \in L$, then we can take $F \in L$.*
(2) $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)$ *or* $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (1,1)$.
(3) $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)$ *or* $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (1,1)$.
(4) $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim (1,1) \nsim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$.
(5) *If we define recursively $G_i := [G_{i-1}, P]$, then $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_i), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0$ for $i \geq 1$.*

Proof. From Lemma 2.2 we obtain G_0 such that the hypothesis of Lemma 2.2 of [8] are satisfied. Hence, by this lemma,

$$F := \frac{\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0)\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)}{[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]} \in L^{(l)}$$

and if P and Q are in L, then $F \in L$. Hence statement (1) is true. Furthermore an easy computation shows that statement (5) is also true and equalities (2.7) are satisfied[5]. Statements (2) and (3) follow from Proposition 2.4. For statement (4), assume that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim (1,1)$. We claim that this implies that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (1,1)$. Otherwise, by statement (2) we have

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \sim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim (1,1),$$

which implies $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \sim (1,1)$, since $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \neq (0,0) \neq \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$. So there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{1\}$ such that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \lambda(1,1)$. But this is impossible because $v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \rho + \sigma$ implies $\lambda = 1$. Hence the claim is true, and so

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) - (1,1) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P),$$

which by Proposition 2.4(1) leads to the contradiction

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (1,1).$$

Similarly $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim (1,1)$. □

Remark 2.7. In general, the conclusions of Theorem 2.6 do not hold if $\rho+\sigma<0$. For instance, consider the following pair in $L^{(1)}$:

$$P = x^2y + x^6y^2(1+6x^2y+9x^4y^2)$$

and

$$Q = x^{-1} + x^3y(2+18x^2y+36x^4y^2) + x^9y^3(8+72x^2y+216x^4y^2+216x^6y^3).$$

Clearly $[P,Q]=1$ and $v_{1,-2}(P)=2>0$. However, one can show that there is no $F\in L^{(1)}$ such that $[F,\ell_{1,-2}(P)]=\ell_{1,-2}(P)$[6].

Remark 2.8. Let $P\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$ and $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}$ with $\rho>0$. If $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p(x^{-\frac{\sigma}{\rho}}y)$, where

$$p := \sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} a_i x^i \in K[x] \quad \text{with } a_0\neq 0 \text{ and } a_\gamma\neq 0,$$

then, by Remark 1.8 with $(\rho_0,\sigma_0)=(0,-1)$,

$$\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \Big(\frac{r}{l}, s\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \Big(\frac{r}{l}-\frac{\gamma\sigma}{\rho}, s+\gamma\Big). \tag{2.8}$$

Definition 2.9. Let $P\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$. We define the set of *directions associated with* P as

$$\operatorname{Dir}(P) := \{(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V} : \#\operatorname{Supp}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))>1\}^{[7]}.$$

Proposition 2.10. *Let $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}^0$ and $P,F\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$. Assume that F is (ρ,σ)-homogeneous, $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)>0$ and*

$$[F,\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P). \tag{2.9}$$

Write

$$F = x^{\frac{u}{l}}y^v f(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p(z) \quad \text{with } z := x^{-\frac{\sigma}{\rho}}y \text{ and } p(0)\neq 0\neq f(0).$$

Then

1. *f is separable and every irreducible factor of p divides f.*
2. *If $(\rho,\sigma)\in\operatorname{Dir}(P)$, then $v_{0,1}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F))<v_{0,1}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F))$.*
3. *Suppose that $p,f\in K[z^k]$ for some $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and let $\overline{p}$ and $\overline{f}$ denote the univariate polynomials defined by $p(z)=\overline{p}(z^k)$ and $f(z)=\overline{f}(z^k)$. Then $\overline{f}$ is separable and every irreducible factor of $\overline{p}$ divides $\overline{f}$.*
4. *If $P,F\in L$ and $v_{0,1}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F))-v_{0,1}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F))=\rho$, then the multiplicity of each linear factor (in an algebraic closure of K) of p is equal to*

$$\frac{1}{\rho}\deg(p) = \frac{1}{\rho}\big(v_{0,1}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P))-v_{0,1}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)\big).$$

5. *Assume that $(\rho,\sigma)\in\operatorname{Dir}(P)$. If $s>0$ or $\#\operatorname{factors}(p)>1$, then there exist no (ρ,σ)-homogeneous element $R\in L^{(l)}$ such that*

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(R)=\rho+\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad [R,\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]=0. \tag{2.10}$$

Consequently, in this case F satisfying (2.9) is unique.

Proof. Note that, since $[-,-]$ is a derivation in both variables, we have

$$[F,\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = \big[x^{\frac{u}{l}}y^v f(z), x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p(z)\big] = x^{\frac{u+r}{l}-1}y^{v+s-1}\big(cf(z)p(z)+azf(z)p'(z)-bzf'(z)p(z)\big),^{[8]}$$

where

$$c := \binom{\frac{u}{l}}{v}\times\binom{\frac{r}{l}}{s}, \quad a := \binom{\frac{u}{l}}{v}\times\binom{-\frac{\sigma}{\rho}}{1} = \frac{1}{\rho}v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \quad \text{and} \quad b := \binom{\frac{r}{l}}{s}\times\binom{-\frac{\sigma}{\rho}}{1} = \frac{1}{\rho}v_{\rho,\sigma}(P).$$

Hence, by equality (2.9) there exists $h \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$z^h p = cpf + azp'f - bzf'p. \tag{2.11}$$

Let g be a linear factor of p in an algebraic closure of K, with multiplicity m. Write $p = p_1 g^m$ and $f = f_1 g^n$, where $n \geq 0$ is the multiplicity of g in f. Since

$$p' = p_1 m g^{m-1} g' + p_1' g^m \quad \text{and} \quad f' = f_1 n g^{n-1} g' + f_1' g^n,$$

equality (2.11) can be written

$$z^h p_1 g^m = g^{m+n-1}\big(g(cp_1 f_1 + azf_1 p_1' - bzf_1' p_1) + (am - bn) z f_1 p_1 g'\big),$$

which implies $n \leq 1$. But $n = 0$ is impossible since $a, m > 0$. So, statement (1) follows.

Assume now $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P)$. Then $\deg p > 0$, and so, by statement (1) we have $\deg f > 0$. Consequently statement (2) follows from Remark 2.8. Using now that

$$zp'(z) = kt\overline{p}'(t) \quad \text{and} \quad zf'(z) = kt\overline{f}'(t) \qquad \text{where } t := z^k,$$

we deduce from (2.11) the equality

$$z^h \overline{p}(t) = c\overline{p}(t)\overline{f}(t) + at\overline{p}'\overline{f}(t) - bt\overline{f}'(t)\overline{p}(t).$$

The same procedure as above, but using this last equality instead of (2.11), yields statement (3).

Now we prove statement (4). Write

$$F = \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha} b_i x^{u-i\sigma} y^{v+i\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} c_i x^{r-i\sigma} y^{s+i\rho}$$

with $b_0 \neq 0$, $b_\alpha \neq 0$, $c_0 \neq 0$ and $c_\gamma \neq 0$. By definition

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha} b_i z^{i\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad p = \sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} c_i z^{i\rho}.$$

Moreover, since by (2.8),

$$\alpha\rho = v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) - v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)),$$

it follows from the hypothesis that $\alpha = 1$. Hence

$$f(z) = b_0 + b_1 z^\rho = \mu(z^\rho - \mu') = \overline{f}(z^\rho),$$

where $\mu := b_1$ and $\mu' := b_0/b_1$. Consequently, by statement (3), there exists $\mu_P \in K^\times$ such that

$$p(z) = \mu_P (z^\rho - \mu')^\gamma,$$

from which statement (4) follows easily. Finally we prove statement (5). For this we first prove (2.12) below, and then we prove that for any R satisfying (2.10) there exists $\lambda \in K^\times$ such that $F_\lambda := F - \lambda R$ satisfies (2.9) and $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_\lambda)$, which is a contradiction.

Assume that $\#\,\mathrm{factors}(p) > 1$ or that $s > 0$. We claim that $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \neq (1,1)$. If the first inequality holds, then, by statement (1), we have $\deg(f) > 1$. Consequently, by Remark 2.8, it is impossible that $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (1,1)$. Assume that $s > 0$. By Proposition 2.4(1), either

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (1,1) \quad \text{or} \quad \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \sim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = (r/l, s).$$

In the first case $v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) = 1$, while in the second one, since by Remark 1.12(1) we know that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \neq (0,0)$, there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \lambda\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$. So $v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) = \lambda s > 0$. In both cases, by statement (2),

$$v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) > v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) \geq 1,$$

which clearly implies $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \neq (1,1)$, as desired. Thus, by Proposition 2.4(2) we conclude that, if $\#\,\mathrm{factors}(p) > 1$ or $s > 0$, then

$$[F, \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F). \tag{2.12}$$

Suppose that $R \in L^{(l)}$ is a (ρ,σ)-homogeneous element that satisfies condition (2.10). By Proposition 2.3 we know that $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R)$ and so $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R)$. Since by Remark 1.12(1)

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \rho + \sigma = v_{\rho,\sigma}(R), \tag{2.13}$$

this implies that

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R). \tag{2.14}$$

Let $\bar{r}$ be an univariate polynomial such that $\bar{r}(0) \neq 0$ and $R = x^{\frac{h}{l}} y^k \bar{r}(z)$. We have

$$F = x^{\frac{\overline{u}}{l}} \mathfrak{f}(z) \quad \text{and} \quad R = x^{\frac{\overline{h}}{l}} \mathfrak{r}(z),$$

where $\mathfrak{f}(z) := z^v f(z)$, $\mathfrak{r}(z) := z^k \bar{r}(z)$, $\overline{u} := u + v\sigma l/\rho$ and $\overline{h} := h + k\sigma l/\rho$. By Remark 2.8 and equality (2.14)

$$\deg(\mathfrak{f}) = \deg(f) + v = v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) = v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R)) = \deg(\bar{r}) + k = \deg(\mathfrak{r}).$$

Moreover $\overline{u} = \overline{h}$ since, by equality (2.13),

$$\rho\frac{\overline{u}}{l} = v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(R) = \rho\frac{\overline{h}}{l}.$$

Let $\lambda \in K^\times$ be such that $\deg(\mathfrak{f} - \lambda\mathfrak{r}) < \deg(\mathfrak{f})$ and let

$$F_\lambda := F - \lambda R = x^{\frac{\overline{u}}{l}} \big(\mathfrak{f}(z) - \lambda\mathfrak{r}(z)\big).$$

Again by Remark 2.8

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_\lambda) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) - t(-\sigma,\rho) \qquad \text{where } t := \frac{\deg(\mathfrak{f}) - \deg(\mathfrak{f} - \lambda\mathfrak{r})}{\rho} > 0.$$

Hence

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \times \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_\lambda) = -t(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \times (-\sigma,\rho)) = -tv_{\rho,\sigma}(P) < 0,$$

and so $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_\lambda)$. But, since

$$[F_\lambda, \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = [F - \lambda R, \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = [F, \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] - \lambda[R, \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = [F, \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P),$$

this contradicts (2.12), and hence, such an R cannot exist. Clearly the uniqueness of F follows, since any other F' satisfying (2.9) yields $R := F - F'$ which satisfies (2.10). □

3 More on the order on directions

In this section we consider the same order on directions as other authors, e. g. [1] and [7], but we profit from the following characterization of this order in small intervals: If I is an interval in $\mathfrak{V}$ and if there is no closed half circle contained in I, which means that there is no $(\rho,\sigma) \in I$ with $(-\rho,-\sigma) \in I$, then for $(\rho,\sigma), (\rho'\sigma') \in I$ we have

$$(\rho,\sigma) < (\rho',\sigma') \Longleftrightarrow (\rho,\sigma) \times (\rho',\sigma') > 0. \tag{3.1}$$

We also present in Proposition 3.9 the chain rule for Jacobians in a convenient way.

Remark 3.1. Let $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}$ and let $P,Q\in L^{(l)}$. If

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)>0,\quad v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)\geq 0\quad\text{and}\quad[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)]=0,$$

then by Proposition 2.1(2) we know that there exist $\lambda_P,\lambda_Q\in K^\times$, $m,n\in\mathbb{N}_0$ coprime and a (ρ,σ)-homogeneous element $R\in L^{(l)}$, with $R\in L$ if $P,Q\in L$, such that

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\lambda_P R^m\qquad\text{and}\qquad\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)=\lambda_Q R^n.$$

Note that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)>0$ implies $m\in\mathbb{N}$. Consequently, we have

(1) $\frac{n}{m}=\frac{v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)}{v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)}$,
(2) $\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)=\frac{n}{m}\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$,
(3) $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)=\frac{n}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$,

and, if moreover $v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)>0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}(\rho,\sigma)\in\operatorname{Dir}(P)&\Leftrightarrow\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)\text{ is not a monomial}\\&\Leftrightarrow R\text{ is not a monomial}\\&\Leftrightarrow\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)\text{ is not a monomial}\\&\Leftrightarrow(\rho,\sigma)\in\operatorname{Dir}(Q).\end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 1.13 the condition $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)]=0$ can be replaced by

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}([P,Q])<v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)+v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)-(\rho+\sigma).$$

We will use freely this fact.

For each $(r/l,s)\in\frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}\setminus\mathbb{Z}(1,1)$ there exists a unique $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$, denoted by $\operatorname{dir}(r/l,s)$, such that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(r/l,s)=0$. In fact clearly

$$(\rho,\sigma)=\begin{cases}(-ls/d,r/d) & \text{if } r-ls>0,\\ (ls/d,-r/d) & \text{if } r-ls<0,\end{cases}\tag{3.2}$$

where $d:=\gcd(r,ls)$, satisfies the required condition, and the uniqueness is evident.

Remark 3.2. Note that if $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$, $(r/l,s)\neq(r'/l,s')$ and $v_{\rho,\sigma}(r/l,s)=v_{\rho,\sigma}(r'/l,s')$ then

$$(\rho,\sigma)=\operatorname{dir}\left(\left(\frac{r}{l},s\right)-\left(\frac{r'}{l},s'\right)\right).$$

In particular

$$(\rho,\sigma)=\operatorname{dir}\big(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)-\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)\big)\qquad\text{for all } P\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}\text{ and }(\rho,\sigma)\in\operatorname{Dir}(P)\cap\mathfrak{V}_{>0}.$$

Definition 3.3. Let $P\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$ which is not a monomial and $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}$. We define the *successor* $\operatorname{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma)$ of (ρ,σ) to be the first element of $\operatorname{Dir}(P)$ that one encounters starting from (ρ,σ) and running counterclockwise, and the *predecessor* $\operatorname{Pred}_P(\rho,\sigma)$, to be the first one, if we run clockwise[10].

Note that $\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$ is the interval $](1,-1),(-1,1)[$ and the order on $\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$ is given by (3.1).

Lemma 3.4. *Let $(a/l,b),(c/l,d)\in\frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}$ and $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$. If $v_{1,-1}(a/l,b)>v_{1,-1}(c/l,d)$, then*

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{a}{l},b\right)>v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{c}{l},d\right)\Longleftrightarrow\operatorname{dir}\left(\left(\frac{a}{l},b\right)-\left(\frac{c}{l},d\right)\right)>(\rho,\sigma)$$

and

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{a}{l},b\right)<v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{c}{l},d\right)\Longleftrightarrow\operatorname{dir}\left(\left(\frac{a}{l},b\right)-\left(\frac{c}{l},d\right)\right)<(\rho,\sigma).$$

Proof. Let

$$(\rho',\sigma') := \operatorname{dir}\big((a/l,b)-(c/l,d)\big) \quad \text{and} \quad g := \gcd(bl-dl, a-c).$$

Since $v_{1,-1}(a/l,b) > v_{1,-1}(c/l,d)$ implies $a-c > bl-dl$, we have

$$(\rho',\sigma') = \left(\frac{dl-bl}{g}, \frac{a-c}{g}\right).$$

Consequently

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{a}{l},b\right) - v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{c}{l},d\right) = \frac{g}{l}\left(\rho\frac{a-c}{g} - \sigma\frac{dl-bl}{g}\right) = \frac{g}{l}\big(\rho\sigma'-\rho'\sigma\big) = \frac{g}{l}\,(\rho,\sigma)\times(\rho',\sigma'),$$

and so, the result follows immediately from (3.1). □

Corollary 3.5. *Let $(a/l,b),(c/l,d)\in \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}$ and $(\rho,\sigma)<(\rho',\sigma')$ in $\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$. If*

$$v_{1,-1}(a/l,b) > v_{1,-1}(c/l,d),$$

then

$$v_{\rho',\sigma'}\left(\frac{a}{l},b\right) \geq v_{\rho',\sigma'}\left(\frac{c}{l},d\right) \Longrightarrow v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{a}{l},b\right) > v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{c}{l},d\right)$$

and

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{a}{l},b\right) \leq v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{c}{l},d\right) \Longrightarrow v_{\rho',\sigma'}\left(\frac{a}{l},b\right) < v_{\rho',\sigma'}\left(\frac{c}{l},d\right).$$

Proof. It follows easily from Lemma 3.4. □

The next two propositions are completely clear. The first one asserts that if you have two consecutive edges of a Newton polygon, then all that is between them is the common vertex. The second one asserts that if the end point of an edge coincides with the starting point of another edge, then they are consecutive.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $P\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$ and let (ρ_1,σ_1) and (ρ_2,σ_2) be consecutive elements in $\operatorname{Dir}(P)$. If $(\rho_1,\sigma_1)<(\rho,\sigma)<(\rho_2,\sigma_2)$, then $\operatorname{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P) = \operatorname{Supp}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = \operatorname{st}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(P)$.*

Proposition 3.7. *Let $P\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$ and let $(\rho,\sigma),(\rho',\sigma')\in\mathfrak{V}$. If $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \operatorname{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)$, then there is no $(\rho'',\sigma'')\in\operatorname{Dir}(P)$ such that $(\rho,\sigma)<(\rho'',\sigma'')<(\rho',\sigma')$.*

Proposition 3.8. *For $k\in\mathbb{Z}$ consider the automorphism of $L^{(l)}$ defined by*

$$\varphi\big(x^{\frac{1}{l}}\big) := x^{\frac{1}{l}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varphi(y) := y + \lambda x^{\frac{k}{l}}.$$

Then there is a direction (ρ,σ) with $\rho>0$, such that $\frac{\sigma}{\rho} = \frac{k}{l}$,

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \varphi(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)), \quad \ell_{-\rho,-\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \varphi(\ell_{-\rho,-\sigma}(P)) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi(P)) = \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P),$$

for all $P\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$ and all $(\rho,\sigma)<(\rho_1,\sigma_1)<(-\rho,-\sigma)$. Moreover $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$.

Proof. Take $d := \gcd(k,l) > 0$, $\rho := l/d$ and $\sigma := k/d$. Clearly $\frac{\sigma}{\rho} = \frac{k}{l}$. Moreover, since φ is (ρ,σ)-homogeneous it is also clear that

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \varphi(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{-\rho,-\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \varphi(\ell_{-\rho,-\sigma}(P))$$

for all $P\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$. Now we prove that the last equality is also true. By the hypothesis about (ρ_1,σ_1) we have $\rho_1\sigma<\rho\sigma_1$. Thus

$$\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}\big(y+\lambda x^{\frac{\sigma}{\rho}}\big) = y,$$

since $\rho>0$. Consequently

$$\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}\big(\varphi(x^{\frac{i}{l}}y^j)\big) = \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}\big(x^{\frac{i}{l}}(y+\lambda x^{\frac{\sigma}{\rho}})^j\big) = x^{\frac{i}{l}}y^j,$$

from which

$$\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi(P)) = \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi(\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P))) = \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P),$$

follows[11]. The last assertion follows from the second equality in (2.8) and the fact that the monomials of greatest degree in y of $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))$ and $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))$ coincide. □

Proposition 3.9. *Let $R_0, R_1 \in \{L, L^{(l)}\}$, $P, Q \in R_0$ and $\varphi\colon R_0 \to R_1$ an algebra morphism. Then*

$$[\varphi(P), \varphi(Q)] = \varphi([P, Q])[\varphi(x), \varphi(y)]. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Recall the (formal) Jacobian chain rule (see for example [2, (1.7), p. 1160]) which generalizes the (formal) derivative chain rule and which says that given any 2-variable rational functions $f_1(x,y), f_2(x,y), g_1(x,y), g_2(x,y) \in K(x,y)$, we have

$$J_{(x,y)}(h_1, h_2) = J_{(f_1,f_2)}(g_1, g_2)J_{(x,y)}(f_1, f_2),$$

where by definition $h_i(x,y) := g_i(f_1(x,y), f_2(x,y))$, and

$$J_{(f_1,f_2)}(g_1, g_2) := j(f_1(x,y), f_2(x,y)) \quad \text{with} \quad j(x,y) := J_{(x,y)}(g_1, g_2). \tag{3.4}$$

Assume first that $l = 1$. Then equality (3.3) follows applying equality (3.4) with

$$g_1 := P, \quad g_2 := Q, \quad f_1 := \varphi(x) \quad \text{and} \quad f_2 := \varphi(y),$$

since $\varphi([P,Q]) = j(\varphi(x), \varphi(y))$, where $j(x,y) := [P,Q] \in L^{(1)} \subseteq K(x,y)$. Assume now that l is arbitrary. Identifying $L^{(l)}$ with $K[z, z^{-1}, y]$ via $z = x^{1/l}$, we obtain

$$[P, Q] = (P_z Q_y - P_y Q_z)\frac{1}{l z^{l-1}}, \quad \text{for } P, Q \in L^{(l)}.$$

Consequently equality (3.3) is valid for $R_0, R_1 \in \{L, L^{(l)}\}$. □

4 Minimal pairs and (m,n)-pairs

Our next aim is to determine a lower bound for

$$B := \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if the jacobian conjecture is true,} \\ \min\big(\gcd(v_{1,1}(P), v_{1,1}(Q))\big) & \text{if JC is false, where } (P,Q) \text{ runs on the counterexamples.} \end{cases}$$

A *minimal pair* is a counterexample (P,Q) to JC such that $B = \gcd(v_{1,1}(P), v_{1,1}(Q))$.

An (m,n)-pair is a Jacobian pair (P,Q) with $P, Q \in L^{(l)}$ for some l, that satisfies certain conditions (see Definition 4.3).

In this section we prove that if $B < \infty$, then there exists a minimal pair that is also an (m,n)-pair for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. We could prove the result using only our previous results, but we prefer to use the well known fact that a counterexample to JC can be brought into a subrectangular shape, following an argument communicated by Leonid Makar-Limanov.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$ be such that $(1,0) \le (\rho,\sigma) \le (0,1)$. If (P,Q) is a counterexample to JC, then*

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0, \qquad v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) - (\rho+\sigma) > 0.$$

Proof. Note that if $(1,0) \le (\rho,\sigma) \le (1,1)$, then $\rho \ge \sigma \ge 0$, while if $(1,1) \le (\rho,\sigma) \le (1,1)$, then $\sigma \ge \rho \ge 0$. In the case $\rho \ge \sigma \ge 0$ it is enough to prove that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P), v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) > \rho$. Assume for example that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \le \rho$, then

$$(i,j) \in \operatorname{Supp}(P) \Longrightarrow i\rho + j\sigma \le \rho \Longrightarrow i = 0, \text{ or } i = 1 \text{ and } j = 0,$$

which means that $P = \mu x + f(y)$ for some $\mu \in K$ and $f \in K[y]$, and obviously (P,Q) can not be a counterexample to JC. The case $\sigma \ge \rho \ge 0$ is similar. □

Remark 4.2. If (P,Q) is a minimal pair, then neither $v_{1,1}(P)$ divides $v_{1,1}(Q)$ nor $v_{1,1}(Q)$ divides $v_{1,1}(P)$. This fact can be proven using a classical argument[12] given for example in the proof of [14, Theorem 10.2.23].

Definition 4.3. Let $m,n \in \mathbb{N}$ be coprime with $n,m>1$. A pair (P,Q) of elements $P,Q \in L^{(l)}$ (respectively $P,Q \in L$) is called an (m,n)-*pair* in $L^{(l)}$ (respectively in L), if

$$[P,Q] \in K^{\times}, \quad \frac{v_{1,1}(P)}{v_{1,1}(Q)} = \frac{v_{1,0}(P)}{v_{1,0}(Q)} = \frac{m}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) < 0.$$

An (m,n)-pair (P,Q) is called *a standard* (m,n)-*pair* if $P,Q \in L^{(1)}$ and $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{1,0}(P)) < 0$.

Remark 4.4. By inequality (1.2) this definition implies $v_{1,0}(P), v_{1,0}(Q) > 0$, and so

$$v_{1,0}(P) + v_{1,0}(Q) - 1 > 0 = v_{1,0}([P,Q]) \qquad \text{for all } (m,n)\text{-pairs.}$$

Hence the hypothesis of Remark 3.1 are satisfied, and so $\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q) = \frac{n}{m}\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$. Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{m}\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P) = \frac{1}{n}\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q) \in \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q)) < 0.$$

Thus $v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) < -1$ and $v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q)) < -1$[13].



FIGURE 1. The shape of $\varphi(P)$ according to Proposition 4.5.

Proposition 4.5. *Let (P,Q) be a minimal pair. Then there exist $m,n \in \mathbb{N}$ which are coprime, and $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ such that $(\varphi(P),\varphi(Q))$ is an (m,n)-pair satisfying $v_{1,1}(\varphi(P)) = v_{1,1}(P)$ and $v_{1,1}(\varphi(Q)) = v_{1,1}(Q)$. Moreover,*

$$(-1,1) < \mathrm{Succ}_{\varphi(P)}(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_{\varphi(Q)}(1,0) < (-1,0). \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Since (P,Q) is a counterexample to JC, by [14, Corollary 10.2.21] there exists an automorphism φ of L and integers $1 \le a \le b$ such that

$$(a,b) \in \mathrm{Supp}(\varphi(P)) \subseteq \{(i,j) : 0 \le i \le a,\ 0 \le j \le b\}. \tag{4.2}$$

We can also achieve that inequality (4.1) is satisfied. This is a well known fact (see for instance [13, page 8] or [11, discussion at 1.12])[14]. We claim that there exist $m,n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\overline{P},\overline{Q}) := (\varphi(P),\varphi(Q))$ is an (m,n)-pair. Clearly

$$\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\overline{P}) = (a,b) = \mathrm{st}_{1,1}(\overline{P}). \tag{4.3}$$

Moreover $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\overline{P})) = a - b < 0$, since by Theorem 2.6(4), we have $a < b$. Now we prove that there exist $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ coprime, such that

$$\frac{v_{1,1}(\overline{P})}{v_{1,1}(\overline{Q})} = \frac{m}{n} = \frac{v_{1,0}(\overline{P})}{v_{1,0}(\overline{Q})}. \tag{4.4}$$

By Proposition 4.1 the hypothesis of Remark 3.1 are satisfied for $(\overline{P}, \overline{Q})$ and all $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$ such that $(1,0) \leq (\rho, \sigma) \leq (1,1)$. Hence there exists $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ coprime such that $\frac{v_{11}(\overline{P})}{v_{11}(\overline{Q})} = \frac{m}{n}$,

$$(a, b) = \mathrm{st}_{1,1}(\overline{P}) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{st}_{1,1}(\overline{Q}) \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Dir}(\overline{Q}) \cap](1,0),(1,1)[= \mathrm{Dir}(\overline{P}) \cap](1,0),(1,1)[= \emptyset,$$

where the last equality follows from (4.3) and Proposition 3.7. Hence by Proposition 3.6 we have $\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\overline{Q}) = \mathrm{st}_{1,1}(\overline{Q})$ which, combined with (4.3) and (4.5), gives

$$\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\overline{P}) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\overline{Q}).$$

This yields equality (4.4).

Next we prove that

$$v_{1,1}(\overline{P}) = v_{1,1}(P) \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{1,1}(\overline{Q}) = v_{1,1}(Q). \tag{4.6}$$

For this consider the inverse $\psi := \varphi^{-1}$. Set $M := v_{1,1}(\psi(x))$ and $N := v_{1,1}(\psi(y))$. By [8] and [14, Corollary 5.1.6(a)], we know that either $N|M$ or $M|N$. If $M = N = 1$ then clearly ψ and φ preserve $v_{1,1}$, as desired.

We assert that the case $M|N$ and $N > 1$, and the case $N|M$ and $M > 1$, are impossible. Assume for example $M|N$ and $N > 1$ and set $R := \ell_{1,1}(\psi(x))$. Since

$$v_{1,1}([\psi(x), \psi(y)]) = 0 < M + N - 2 = v_{1,1}(\psi(x)) + v_{1,1}(\psi(y)) - 2,$$

It follows from Proposition 1.13, that $[\ell_{1,1}(\psi(x)), \ell_{1,1}(\psi(y))] = 0$. Hence, by Proposition 2.1,

$$\ell_{1,1}(\psi(y)) = \lambda R^k \qquad \text{for some } \lambda \in K^\times \text{ and } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By (4.2) we know that $\ell_{1,1}(\overline{P}) = \lambda_P x^a y^b$ for some $\lambda_P \in K^\times$, and that

$$i \leq a, \quad j \leq b \quad \text{and} \quad i + j < a + b \qquad \text{for all } (i,j) \in \mathrm{Supp}(\overline{P}) \setminus \{(a,b)\}.$$

Hence, for all such (i,j), we have

$$v_{1,1}(\psi(x^i y^j)) = i v_{1,1}(R) + j v_{1,1}(R^k) < a v_{1,1}(R) + b v_{1,1}(R^k) = v_{1,1}(\psi(x^a y^b)),$$

and so

$$v_{1,1}(\psi(\overline{P})) = v_{1,1}(\psi(x^a y^b)) = v_{1,1}(R)(a + kb). \tag{4.7}$$

On the other hand by equality (4.5) we can write $a = \bar{a}m$ and $b = \bar{b}m$ with $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence equality (4.7) can be written as

$$v_{1,1}(\psi(\overline{P})) = m v_{1,1}(R)(\bar{a} + k\bar{b}).$$

By (4.5) we have $\mathrm{st}_{1,1}(\overline{Q}) = \frac{n}{m}(a,b) = n(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$. So, by Proposition 4.1 and Remark 3.1,

$$(n\bar{a}, n\bar{b}) \in \mathrm{Supp}(\overline{Q}) \subseteq \{(i,j) : 0 \leq i \leq n\bar{a},\ 0 \leq j \leq n\bar{b}\}. \tag{4.8}$$

A similar computation as above, but using (4.8) instead of (4.2), shows that

$$v_{1,1}(\psi(\overline{Q})) = n v_{1,1}(R)(\bar{a} + k\bar{b}).^{[15]}$$

Consequently

$$\gcd(v_{1,1}(\psi(\overline{P}))v_{1,1}(\psi(\overline{Q}))) = v_{1,1}(R)(\bar{a} + k\bar{b}) \geq \bar{a} + \bar{b} = \gcd(v_{1,1}(\overline{P}), v_{1,1}(\overline{Q})),$$

where the last equality follows from equality (4.5).

Since $(\psi(\overline{P}), \psi(\overline{Q}))) = (P, Q)$ is a minimal pair, equality must hold, and so we have $k = 1$ and $v_{1,1}(R) = 1$, which contradicts $kv_{1,1}(R) = v_{1,1}(\ell_{1,1}(\psi(y))) = N > 1$.

Similarly one discards the case $N|M$ and $M > 1$, which finishes the proof of (4.6).

Hence $(\overline{P}, \overline{Q})$ is minimal pair and so, by Remark 4.2, we have $m, n > 1$. □

5 Regular corners of (m, n)-pairs

It is known (see e.g. [14, Theorem 10.2.1]) that the Newton polygons of a Jacobian pair (P, Q) in L are similar. The same is not true in $L^{(l)}$, but it is almost true. One of the basic geometric reasons for this difference is the fact that, by Propositions 1.13, 2.3 and 2.4, if two corners of P and Q are not aligned, then they must sum $(1, 1)$. In L this is only possible for $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$, but in $L^{(l)}$ this happens for all $(k/l, 0)$ and $(1-k/l, 1)$ if $k \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\}$ (see Case I.b), equality (5.5)).

We will analyze the edges and corners of the Newton polygons of an (m, n)-pair, corresponding to the directions in

$$I :=](1, -1), (1, 0)] = \{(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V} : (1, -1) < (\rho, \sigma) \leq (1, 0)\}.$$

Note that for $(\rho, \sigma) \in I$ we have $\rho + \sigma > 0$, $\sigma \leq 0$ and $\rho > 0$. In particular we will analyze what we call regular corners (see Definition 5.5). The conditions we will find on regular corners will allow us to discard many "small" cases in Sections 6 and 7, and to obtain lower bounds for B.

From now on we assume that K is algebraically closed unless otherwise stated.

Lemma 5.1. *Let (P, Q) be an (m, n)-pair in $L^{(l)}$ and let $(\rho, \sigma) \in I$. If $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$, then $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0$ and $v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) > 0$. Moreover, if $v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < -1$ or $v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) < -1$, then $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = 0$.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \leq 0$. Then $v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = \frac{n}{m}v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \leq 0$. But then, since $\rho + \sigma > 0$, we have

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) - (\rho + \sigma) < 0 = v_{\rho,\sigma}([P, Q]),$$

which contradicts (1.2) and proves $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0$. The same argument proves that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) > 0$.

Now assume for instance that

$$v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < -1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad [\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] \neq 0.$$

Since $(0, -1) < (\rho, \sigma) < (0, 1)$, by Remark 1.8 we have

$$v_{0,-1}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = v_{0,-1}(\ell_{0,-1}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))) = v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < -1,$$

and so, we obtain

$$v_{0,-1}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) + v_{0,-1}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) - (-1 + 0) < 0 = v_{0,-1}([\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)]),$$

which contradicts inequality (1.2), proving $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = 0$. Similar arguments apply to the case $v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) < -1$. □

For $P \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\}$ we set

$$A(P) := \{(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap I : v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < -1 \text{ and } v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < 0\}.$$

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap I$. If $(\rho', \sigma') < (\rho, \sigma) \leq (1, 0)$ for some $(\rho', \sigma') \in A(P)$, then $(\rho, \sigma) \in A(P)$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the result in the case in which $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$. In this case, since $(0,-1) < (\rho',\sigma') < (0,1)$ and $(1,-1) < (\rho',\sigma') < (-1,1)$, it follows from Remark 1.8 that

$$v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) < v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) < -1$$

and

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) < v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) < 0,$$

which implies that $(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$. □

Proposition 5.3. *Let (P,Q) be an (m,n)-pair and $(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}) := \max(A(P))$. Then*

$$](\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}),(1,0)] \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Assume that the statement is false and take

$$(\rho,\sigma) := \max\big(](\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}),(1,0)] \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q)\big).$$

By Proposition 5.2 we know that $](\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}),(1,0)] \cap \mathrm{Dir}(P) = \emptyset$. Hence, by Proposition 3.6,

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P), \tag{5.1}$$

and so, by Remark 4.4,

$$v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) < -1.$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q),$$

where the first equality follows from (5.1), the second on from the definition of (m,n)-pair, and the third one, from the fact that $](\rho,\sigma),(1,0)] \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q) = \emptyset$ and Proposition 3.6. Hence, by Lemma 5.1 and Remark 3.1, we conclude that $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P)$, which is a contradiction. □

Proposition 5.4. *If (P,Q) is an (m,n)-pair and $(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$, then*

(1) $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$,
(2) $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$,
(3) $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(Q)$.

Moreover $A(Q) = A(P)$ and, if we set

$$(\rho_1,\sigma_1) := \begin{cases} \min(A(P)) & \text{if } A(P) \neq \emptyset, \\ \min(\mathrm{Succ}_P(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_Q(1,0)) & \text{if } A(P) = \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

then $\mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_1,\sigma_1) = \mathrm{Pred}_Q(\rho_1,\sigma_1) \in I$.

Proof. Assume $A(P) \neq \emptyset$ and write $A(P) = \{(\rho_1,\sigma_1) < (\rho_2,\sigma_2) < \cdots < (\rho_k,\sigma_k)\}$, where we are considering the order of I. We will prove inductively statements (1), (2) and (3) for (ρ_j,σ_j), starting from $j = k$. Let $(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}) := \max(A(P) \cup A(Q))$. We have

$$\mathrm{en}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(Q),$$

where the first equality follows from Propositions 3.6 and 5.2, the second one, from Remark 4.4 and the third one, from Propositions 3.6, since $](\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}),(1,0)] \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q) = \emptyset$ by Propositions 5.2 and 5.3. Hence, by Lemma 5.1 and Remark 3.1, we have

$$(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{st}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{st}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(Q).$$

On the other hand by Proposition 5.2, we have $(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}) = (\rho_k,\sigma_k)$, and so statements (1), (2) and (3) hold for (ρ_k,σ_k).

Let now $j \geq 1$, assume that statements (1), (2) and (3) hold for $(\rho_{j+1}, \sigma_{j+1})$ and set

$$(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma}) = \max\{\mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_{j+1}, \sigma_{j+1}), \mathrm{Pred}_Q(\rho_{j+1}, \sigma_{j+1})\}.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{en}_{\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma}}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_{j+1},\sigma_{j+1}}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho_{j+1},\sigma_{j+1}}(Q) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma}}(Q),$$

where the second equality holds by condition 2) for $(\rho_{j+1}, \sigma_{j+1})$. Moreover by Propositions 5.2 and 3.6,

$$(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma}) = (\rho_j, \sigma_j) \qquad \text{or} \qquad \mathrm{st}_{\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma}}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma}}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_{j+1},\sigma_{j+1}}(P),$$

and so $v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma}}(P)) < -1$. Hence, by Lemma 5.1 and Remark 3.1, we have

$$(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma}) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{st}_{\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma}}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{st}_{\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma}}(Q).$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 5.2 we have $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma}) = (\rho_j, \sigma_j)$, and so statements (1), (2) and (3) hold for (ρ_j, σ_j).

Now we will prove that $A(P) = A(Q)$. By symmetry it suffices to prove that $A(P) \subseteq A(Q)$. Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in A(P)$. By statement (3) we already know $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(Q)$. So we have to prove only that

$$v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) < -1 \quad \text{and} \quad v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) < 0.$$

By statement (2)

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) = \frac{n}{m} v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < 0.$$

Note now that again by statement (2)

$$\frac{1}{m} v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and so

$$\frac{1}{m} v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \leq -1,$$

since $v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < 0$. Hence, once again by statement (2),

$$v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) = \frac{n}{m} v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \leq -n < -1,$$

which proves $A(P) \subseteq A(Q)$, as desired.

Now we prove

$$(\rho_0, \sigma_0) := \mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = \mathrm{Pred}_Q(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \in I.$$

Set $(\hat{\rho}, \hat{\sigma}) := \max\{\mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_1, \sigma_1), \mathrm{Pred}_Q(\rho_1, \sigma_1)\}$. We first prove that

$$(1, -1) < (\hat{\rho}, \hat{\sigma}) < (\rho_1, \sigma_1).$$

Assume by contradiction that $(-\rho_1, -\sigma_1) \leq (\hat{\rho}, \hat{\sigma}) \leq (1, -1)$, which, by Proposition 3.6, implies that

$$\mathrm{en}_{1,-1}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{1,-1}(Q) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q). \tag{5.2}$$

If $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \in A(P) \cap A(Q)$, then this implies

$$v_{1,-1}(P) = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P)) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_{1,-1}(Q) = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q)) < 0,$$

and so, by inequality (1.2), we have $v_{1,-1}([P, Q]) < 0$, which contradicts that $[P, Q] \in K^\times$. Hence we can suppose that $A(P) = \emptyset$, which by Proposition 3.6, implies that

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q).$$

Consequently, by (5.2),

$$\mathrm{en}_{1,-1}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{1,-1}(Q) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q).$$

By the definition of (m,n)-pair and Remark 4.4, this implies that

$$v_{1,-1}(P) = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_{1,-1}(Q) = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q)) < 0,$$

and so, again by inequality (1.2), we have $v_{1,-1}([P,Q]) < 0$, which contradicts that $[P,Q] \in K^{\times}$.

In order to conclude the proof, we must show that $\mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_1,\sigma_1) = \mathrm{Pred}_Q(\rho_1,\sigma_1)$. Assume this is false and suppose for example that $\mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_1,\sigma_1) < \mathrm{Pred}_Q(\rho_1,\sigma_1)$, which implies

$$\mathrm{st}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P). \tag{5.3}$$

If $A(P) \neq \emptyset$, then by Lemma 5.1, the conditions of Remark 3.1 are satisfied for $(\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma})$. Consequently, by this remark, $(\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P)$, contradicting (5.3). Assume now $A(P) = \emptyset$, which implies that $(\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}) \leq (1,0) < (\rho_1,\sigma_1)$. Hence, by (5.3), Proposition 3.6 and Remark 4.4,

$$\mathrm{st}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P) = \frac{n}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q) = \frac{n}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(Q)$$

and

$$v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P)) = v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) < -1.$$

Hence again by Lemma 5.1, the conditions of Remark 3.1 are satisfied for $(\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma})$, and therefore $(\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P)$, which contradicts (5.3). The case $\mathrm{Pred}_Q(\rho_1,\sigma_1) < \mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_1,\sigma_1)$, can be discarded using a similar argument. □

Definition 5.5. A *regular corner* of an (m,n)-pair (P,Q), in $L^{(l)}$, is a pair $(A,(\rho,\sigma))$, where $A = (a/l, b) \in \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0$ and $(\rho,\sigma) \in I$ such that

(1) $b \geq 1$ and $b > a/l$,
(2) $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P)$,
(3) $\left(\frac{a}{l}, b\right) = \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$.

A regular corner $(A,(\rho,\sigma))$ is said to be *at* the point A.

Proposition 5.6. *If $(A,(\rho,\sigma))$ is a regular corner of an (m,n)-pair (P,Q), then at least one of the following three facts is true:*

(a) $(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$,
(b) $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$,
(c) $(\rho,\sigma) = \mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_1,\sigma_1)$, *where* $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) := \min(A(P))$.

Moreover, there exists exactly one regular corner $(A,(\rho,\sigma))$ such that $(\rho,\sigma) \notin A(P)$.

Proof. Assume that $(\rho,\sigma) \notin A(P)$ and define $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) := \mathrm{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma)$. If $(\rho,\sigma) < (\rho_1,\sigma_1) \leq (1,0)$, then $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) \in A(P)$[16], which implies that $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) = \min(A(P))$ by Proposition 5.2, and so item (c) holds. Otherwise $(\rho,\sigma) \leq (1,0) < (\rho_1,\sigma_1)$ and, by Proposition 3.6, we conclude that $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$. □

Corollary 5.7. *If $(A,(\rho,\sigma))$ is a regular corner of an (m,n)-pair (P,Q), then*

(1) $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0$ *and* $v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) > 0$,
(2) $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$,
(3) $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(Q)$.

Proof. If $(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$, or $(\rho,\sigma) = \mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_1,\sigma_1)$, where $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) := \min(A(P))$, then Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.4 yield the result[17]. Hence, by Proposition 5.6, it suffices to prove the assertions when $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$ and $(\rho,\sigma) \notin A(P)$. We claim that $A(P) = \emptyset$. In fact, if there exists $(\rho',\sigma') \in A(P)$ with $(\rho',\sigma') < (\rho,\sigma)$, then $(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$ by Proposition 5.2. On the other hand, if there exists $(\rho',\sigma') \in A(P)$ with $(\rho',\sigma') > (\rho,\sigma)$, then

$$(\rho',\sigma') \geq \mathrm{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma) = \mathrm{Succ}_P(1,0) > (1,0),\,[18]$$

which contradicts $(\rho', \sigma') \in I$. Now we set

$$(\rho'_1, \sigma'_1) := \min(\mathrm{Succ}_P(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_Q(1,0)).$$

Then $(\rho, \sigma) = \mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho'_1, \sigma'_1)$[19] and from Proposition 5.4 we obtain

$$(\rho, \sigma) = \mathrm{Pred}_Q(\rho'_1, \sigma'_1) \in \mathrm{Dir}(Q).$$

Since $(\rho, \sigma) \leq (1,0) < (\rho'_1, \sigma'_1)$, by Proposition 3.6 this implies $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q)$. Consequently, by Remark 4.4,

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(Q) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q),$$

and Lemma 5.1 concludes the proof. □

Remark 5.8. If $((a/l, b), (\rho, \sigma))$ is a regular corner of an (m,n)-pair (P,Q) in $L^{(l)}$, then $a > 0$[20].

Let $(A, (\rho, \sigma))$ be a regular corner of an (m,n)-pair (P,Q) in $L^{(l)}$. Write

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = x^{k/l}\mathfrak{p}(z) \quad \text{where } z := x^{-\sigma/\rho}y \text{ and } \mathfrak{p}(z) \in K[z]. \tag{5.4}$$

Since $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P)$ the polynomial $\mathfrak{p}(z)$ is not a constant. Moreover by Corollary 5.7(1) and Theorem 2.6(4) we know that $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \neq 0$. Hence, one of the following five mutually excluding conditions is true:

- I.a) $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] \neq 0$ and $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$.
- I.b) $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] \neq 0$ and $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$.
- II.a) $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = 0$, $\#\,\mathrm{factors}(\mathfrak{p}(z)) > 1$ and $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < 0$.
- II.b) $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = 0$, $\#\,\mathrm{factors}(\mathfrak{p}(z)) > 1$ and $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) > 0$.
- III) $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = 0$ and $\mathfrak{p}(z) = \mu(z-\lambda)^r$ for some $\mu, \lambda \in K^\times$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 5.9. Let (P,Q) be an (m,n)-pair in $L^{(l)}$ and let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap I$. If $(A, (\rho', \sigma'))$ is a regular corner and $(\rho', \sigma') < (\rho, \sigma) \leq (1,0)$, then $(\rho, \sigma) \in A(P)$. In fact, by Proposition 5.2, it suffices to consider the case in which $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$, and in that case it follows easily from the definition of $A(P)$ and Definition 5.5.

Remark 5.10. Let (P,Q) be an (m,n)-pair in $L^{(l)}$ and let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$. If $(\rho, \sigma) \in A(P)$ then $\left(\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P), (\rho, \sigma)\right)$ is a regular corner and we are in the Case II.a)[21].

Remark 5.11. In the Case II.a), if we set $(\rho', \sigma') := \mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho, \sigma)$, then $\left(\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P), (\rho', \sigma')\right)$ is a regular corner of (P,Q)[22].

Remark 5.12. If (P,Q) is an (m,n)-pair, then $\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$ is the first component of a regular corner of (P,Q)[23].

Proposition 5.13 (Cases I.a) and I.b))**.** *Let (P,Q) be an (m,n)-pair in $L^{(l)}$, and $((a/l, b), (\rho, \sigma))$ a regular corner of (P,Q). Assume $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] \neq 0$. Then $l - a/b > 1$ and the following assertions hold:*

a) If $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$, then

$$\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \in \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim (1,0).$$

b) If $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \nsim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$, then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$, with $k < l - \frac{a}{b}$, such that

$$\{\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)\} = \left\{\left(\frac{k}{l}, 0\right), \left(1 - \frac{k}{l}, 1\right)\right\}. \tag{5.5}$$

Proof. a) Since $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$, it follows from Corollary 5.7, that

$$\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \frac{1}{n}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q),$$

and so

$$A' := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \in \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{5.6}$$

because m and n are coprime. Hence $A' = (a'/l, b')$ with $a' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $b' \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Now we prove that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \sim (1,0)$ or, equivalently, that $b' = 0$. Assume by contradiction that $b' > 0$. By Remark 2.8 we can write

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = x^{\frac{ma'}{l}} y^{mb'} f(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = x^{\frac{na'}{l}} y^{nb'} g(z),$$

where $z := x^{-\frac{\sigma}{\rho}} y$ and $f(z), g(z) \in K[z]$. Since $nb', mb' \geq 1$, the term y divides both $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ and $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$. Consequently y is a factor of $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)]$. Since by Proposition 1.13, we know that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}([P,Q]) \in K^\times$, this is a contradiction which proves that $b' = 0$.

We next prove $l - a/b > 1$ in this case. Since, by Corollary 5.7(1),

$$a' = \frac{l}{\rho} v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{a'}{l}, 0\right) = \frac{l}{\rho m} v_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) > 0,$$

it suffices to show that $l - a/b > a'$. Assume that this is false. Then $1 - \frac{a'}{l} \leq \frac{a}{bl}$, and so

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(1 - \frac{a'}{l}, 1\right) \leq \frac{1}{b} v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{a}{l}, b\right) = \frac{1}{bm} v_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)),$$

since $\rho > 0$. Moreover,

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{a'}{l}, 0\right) = \frac{1}{m} v_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)),$$

and so, by Proposition 1.13,

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = \rho + \sigma = v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(1 - \frac{a'}{l}, 1\right) + v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(\frac{a'}{l}, 0\right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{bm} + \frac{1}{m}\right) v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \leq v_{\rho,\sigma}(P).$$

But this is impossible since $v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) > 0$ by Corollary 5.7(1).

b) By Proposition 1.13,

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}([P,Q]) \in K^\times,$$

and consequently, by Proposition 2.4(1),

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = (1,1).$$

Therefore equality (5.5) is true for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Applying $v_{\rho,\sigma}$ we obtain

$$\left\{\rho\frac{k}{l}, \rho\left(1 - \frac{k}{l}\right) + \sigma\right\} = \{v_{\rho,\sigma}(P), v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)\},$$

which by Corollary 5.7(1), implies $k > 0$. Assume that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = \left(1 - \frac{k}{l}, 1\right)$. By Corollary 5.7(2),

$$n\left(\rho\frac{a}{l} + \sigma b\right) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(1 - \frac{k}{l}, 1\right) = \rho - \rho\frac{k}{l} + \sigma,$$

and so

$$k = l - na + \frac{\sigma l}{\rho}(1 - bn). \tag{5.7}$$

On the other hand, since $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0$ and $\frac{l}{\rho bm} > 0$, we have

$$\frac{l\sigma}{\rho} + \frac{a}{b} = \frac{l}{\rho b}\left(\rho\frac{a}{l} + \sigma b\right) = \frac{l}{\rho bm} v_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) > 0.$$

Multiplying this inequality by $bn-1>0$, we obtain

$$\frac{\sigma l}{\rho}(1-bn)<\frac{a}{b}(bn-1).$$

Combining this with equality (5.7) we conclude that

$$k=l-na+\frac{\sigma l}{\rho}(1-bn)<l-na+\frac{a}{b}(bn-1)=l-\frac{a}{b},$$

as desired. In the case $\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\left(1-\frac{k}{l},1\right)$ the proof of $k<l-\frac{a}{b}$ is similar. Since $k\geq 1$ we also obtain $l-a/b>1$ in the case b). □

Proposition 5.14 (Case II)**.** *Let (P,Q) be an (m,n)-pair in $L^{(l)}$, let $((a/l,b),(\rho,\sigma))$ be a regular corner of (P,Q) and let F be as in Theorem 2.6. Assume that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)]=0$ and write $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=x^{k/l}\mathfrak{p}(z)$, where $z:=x^{-\sigma/\rho}y$ and $\mathfrak{p}(z)\in K[z]$. If $\#\operatorname{factors}(\mathfrak{p}(z))>1$, then*

(1) $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)\sim(a/l,b)$.

(2) $\rho/\gcd(\rho,l)\leq b$.

Set $d:=\gcd(a,b)$, $\overline{a}:=a/d$, $\overline{b}:=b/d$ and write $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)=\mu(\overline{a}/l,\overline{b})$. We have:

(3) $(\rho,\sigma)=\operatorname{dir}\left(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)-(1,1)\right)=\operatorname{dir}(\mu\overline{a}-l,\mu\overline{b}l-l)$.

(4) $\mu\in\mathbb{N}$, $\mu\leq l(bl-a)+1/\overline{b}$, $d\nmid\mu$ *and* $d>1$.

Proof. Write $F=x^{1+\sigma/\rho}\mathfrak{f}(z)$, where $\mathfrak{f}(z)\in K[z]$. Note that $\mathfrak{p}(z)=z^sp(z)$ and $\mathfrak{f}(z)=z^vf(z)$, where p, f, s and v are the same as in Proposition 2.10. Moreover $s>0$ implies $v>0$ by Remark 2.8 and Theorem 2.6(2), and so, by Proposition 2.10(1), each irreducible factor of $\mathfrak{p}$ divides $\mathfrak{f}$. Since $\#\operatorname{factors}(\mathfrak{p}(z))>1$, we have $\deg(\mathfrak{f})\geq 2$. Hence $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)\neq(1,1)$ by Remark 2.8. Consequently, by Theorem 2.6(3), we have $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)\sim\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ which yields statement (1).

Now we prove statement (2). Let $A_1':=\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$. By Remark 3.1(2) we have $A_1'\in\frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{N}_0$. Write $A_1'=(a'/l,b')$. Since $b'<b$ by Remark 2.8, and $v_{\rho,\sigma}(a/l,b)=v_{\rho,\sigma}(a'/l,b')$, there exists $h\in\mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\left(-\frac{\sigma hl/\rho}{l},h\right)=h\left(-\frac{\sigma}{\rho},1\right)=\left(\frac{a}{l},b\right)-\left(\frac{a'}{l},b'\right)\in\frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{N}_0,$$

Hence ρ divides σhl. Set

$$\overline{\rho}:=\frac{\rho}{\gcd(\rho,l)}\quad\text{and}\quad\overline{l}:=\frac{l}{\gcd(\rho,l)}.$$

Clearly $\overline{\rho}$ divides $h\sigma\overline{l}$, and so $\overline{\rho}\mid h=b-b'$, which implies $\overline{\rho}\leq b$, as desired.

Statement (3) follows from Remark 3.2 and the fact that $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)\neq(1,1)$.

It remains to prove statement (4). First note that $\mu\in\mathbb{N}$, since $\overline{b}\in\mathbb{N}$, $\mu\overline{b}\in\mathbb{N}$, $\mu\overline{a}\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $\gcd(\overline{a},\overline{b})=1$. On the other hand, by Remark 3.1 we know that there exists $\lambda_P,\lambda_Q\in K^\times$ and a (ρ,σ)-homogeneous element $R\in L^{(l)}$, such that

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\lambda_PR^m\qquad\text{and}\qquad\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)=\lambda_QR^n,$$

which implies

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R)=(a/l,b)=d(\overline{a}/l,\overline{b})=\frac{d}{\mu}\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F).$$

Next we prove that $d\nmid\mu$. In fact, if we assume that $d|\mu$, then we have

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(R^{\mu/d})=v_{\rho,\sigma}(F)=\rho+\sigma\qquad\text{and}\qquad[R^{\mu/d},\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]=0,$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $[-,-]$ is a Poisson bracket and $[R^n, \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0$. But this contradicts Proposition 2.10(5) and proves $d \nmid \mu$. From this it follows immediately that $d > 1$. Finally we prove that $\mu \leq l(bl-a) + 1/\overline{b}$. Since

$$(\mu\overline{a} - l) - (\mu\overline{b}l - l) = \mu(\overline{a} - \overline{b}l) = \frac{\mu}{d}(a - bl) < 0,$$

from equalities (3.2) and statement (3) it follows that

$$\rho = \frac{(\mu\overline{b} - 1)l}{d_1}, \quad \text{where } d_1 := \gcd(\mu\overline{a} - l, \mu\overline{b}l - l).$$

Now note that d_1 divides $\overline{b}l(\mu\overline{a} - l) - \overline{a}(\mu\overline{b}l - l) = l(\overline{a} - \overline{b}l)$, and therefore

$$d_1 \leq l(\overline{b}l - \overline{a}),$$

since $\overline{b}l - \overline{a} > 0$. Hence, by statement (2),

$$b \geq \frac{\rho}{\gcd(\rho, l)} \geq \frac{\rho}{l} = \frac{(\mu\overline{b} - 1)}{d_1} \geq \frac{(\mu\overline{b} - 1)}{l(\overline{b}l - \overline{a})},$$

which implies $\mu\overline{b} - 1 \leq bl(\overline{b}l - \overline{a}) = \overline{b}l(bl - a)$, as desired. □



FIGURE 2. Remark 5.15 with $\lambda = \frac{m}{l}\left(\frac{a\rho + bl\sigma}{\rho + \sigma}\right)$.

Remark 5.15. Let $((a/l, b), (\rho, \sigma))$ be a regular corner of an (m, n)-pair (P, Q) and let L be the straight line that includes $\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))$. The intersection of L with the diagonal $x = y$ is the point

$$\lambda(1,1), \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda = \frac{m}{l}\left(\frac{a\rho + bl\sigma}{\rho + \sigma}\right).$$

In fact

$$\lambda(\rho + \sigma) = v_{\rho,\sigma}\big(\lambda(1,1)\big) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(m(a/l, b)) = \frac{m}{l}(a\rho + bl\sigma),$$

from which the assertion follows.

The following proposition about multiplicities can be traced back to [8, Corollary 2.6(2)]. The algebraic parallel is not so clear, but the geometric meaning, which will be proved in Proposition 5.18, is that one can cut the support of $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ above the diagonal.

Proposition 5.16 (Case II.b)). *Let (P,Q) and $((a/l,b),(\rho,\sigma))$ be as in Proposition 5.14. Assume that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)]=0$ and write $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=x^{k/l}\mathfrak{p}(z)$ where $z:=x^{-\sigma/\rho}y$ and $\mathfrak{p}(z)\in K[z]$. If $\#\,\text{factors}(\mathfrak{p}(z))>1$ and $v_{1,-1}(\text{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P))>0$, then there exists $\lambda\in K^\times$ such that $z-\lambda$ has multiplicity*

$$m_\lambda \geq \frac{m}{l}\left(\frac{a\rho+bl\sigma}{\rho+\sigma}\right)$$

in $\mathfrak{p}(z)$.

Proof. Let F be as in Theorem 2.6 and write $F=x^{1+\sigma/\rho}\mathfrak{f}(z)$. In the proof of Proposition 5.14 it was shown that each irreducible factor of $\mathfrak{p}$ divides $\mathfrak{f}$. Hence, there is a linear factor of $\mathfrak{p}$ with multiplicity greater than or equal to $\deg(\mathfrak{p})/\deg(\mathfrak{f})$. Since $\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=(ma/l,mb)$, it follows from Remark 2.8, that $\deg(\mathfrak{p})=mb$. Similarly, if we write $\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)=(M_0,M)$, then $M=\deg(\mathfrak{f})$, an so $\deg(\mathfrak{p})/\deg(\mathfrak{f})=mb/M$. Consequently, in order to finish the proof it suffices to check that

$$\frac{mb}{M}=\frac{m}{l}\left(\frac{a\rho+bl\sigma}{\rho+\sigma}\right). \tag{5.8}$$

Since

$$\rho+\sigma=v_{\rho,\sigma}(F)=\rho M_0+\sigma M,$$

we have

$$M_0=\frac{1}{\rho}(\rho+\sigma-\sigma M).$$

Hence, by Proposition 5.14(1),

$$\frac{a}{bl}=\frac{M_0}{M}=\frac{\rho+\sigma-\sigma M}{\rho M},$$

which implies

$$M=\frac{bl(\rho+\sigma)}{a\rho+bl\sigma}.$$

Therefore equality (5.8) is true. □

Proposition 5.17 (Case III). *Let (P,Q) be an (m,n)-pair in $L^{(l)}$ and let $((a/l,b),(\rho,\sigma))$ be a regular corner of (P,Q). Assume that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)]=0$ and write $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=x^{k/l}\mathfrak{p}(z)$ where $z:=x^{-\sigma/\rho}y$ and $\mathfrak{p}(z)\in K[z]$. If there exist $\mu,\lambda\in K^\times$ and $r\in\mathbb{N}$, such that $\mathfrak{p}(z)=\mu(z-\lambda)^r$, then $\rho\,|\,l$. Moreover, the automorphism φ of $L^{(l)}$, defined by $\varphi(x^{1/l}):=x^{1/l}$ and $\varphi(y):=y+\lambda x^{\sigma/\rho}$, satisfies*

(1) $\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))=\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ *and for all $(\rho,\sigma)<(\rho'',\sigma'')<(-\rho,-\sigma)$ the equalities*

$$\ell_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(P))=\ell_{\rho'',\sigma''}(P)\quad\text{and}\quad\ell_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(Q))=\ell_{\rho'',\sigma''}(Q),$$

hold.

(2) *$(\varphi(P),\varphi(Q))$ is an (m,n)-pair in $L^{(l)}$.*

(3) *$((a/l,b),(\rho',\sigma'))$ is a regular corner of $(\varphi(P),\varphi(Q))$, where $(\rho',\sigma'):=\text{Pred}_{\varphi(P)}(\rho,\sigma)$.*

(4) *$(a/l,b)=\frac{1}{m}\,\text{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))$.*

Proof. Clearly the conditions imply that

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=x^{k/l}\mu\left(\lambda^r-\binom{r}{1}\lambda^{r-1}z+\cdots\right).$$

Hence $(k/l-\sigma/\rho,1)\in\text{Supp}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))\subseteq\frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{N}_0$. So $\sigma/\rho\in\frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z}$, which evidently implies $\rho|l$, because $\gcd(\rho,\sigma)=1$. From Proposition 3.8 we obtain statement (1). Statement (2) follows easily from Proposition 3.9, statement (1) and the fact that by Proposition 3.8 we know that

$\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\varphi(P)) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$, even in the case where $(\rho,\sigma) = (1,0)$. Finally, statements (3) and (4) follow from Propositions 3.6, 3.8 and 5.4 [24]. □

By Proposition 5.16 the hypothesis of the next proposition are always fulfilled in Case II.b). Sometimes they are fulfilled in Case II.a).

Proposition 5.18 (Case II)**.** *Let (P,Q) and $((a/l,b),(\rho,\sigma))$ be as in Proposition 5.14 and let $l' := \mathrm{lcm}(\rho,l)$. Assume that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)]=0$ and write $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)= x^{k/l}\mathfrak{p}(z)$ where $z := x^{-\sigma/\rho}y$ and $\mathfrak{p}(z) \in K[z]$. Assume also that $\#\,\mathrm{factors}(\mathfrak{p}(z)) > 1$ and that there exists $\lambda \in K^\times$ such that the multiplicity m_λ of $z-\lambda$ in $\mathfrak{p}(z)$, satisfies*

$$m_\lambda \geq \frac{m}{l}\left(\frac{a\rho+bl\sigma}{\rho+\sigma}\right). \tag{5.9}$$

Define $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(L^{(l')})$ by $\varphi(x^{1/l'}) := x^{1/l'}$ and $\varphi(y) := y + \lambda x^{\sigma/\rho}$, and set

$$A^{(1)} := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) \qquad \text{and} \qquad (\rho',\sigma') := \mathrm{Pred}_{\varphi(P)}(\rho,\sigma).$$

Then

(1) *We have $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ and for all $(\rho,\sigma) < (\rho'',\sigma'') < (-\rho,-\sigma)$ the equalities*
$$\ell_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(P)) = \ell_{\rho'',\sigma''}(P) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(Q)) = \ell_{\rho'',\sigma''}(Q)$$
hold.

(2) *$(\varphi(P),\varphi(Q))$ is an (m,n)-pair in $L^{(l')}$.*

(3) *$(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(\varphi(P))$, $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \left(\frac{k}{l},0\right) + m_\lambda\left(-\frac{\sigma}{\rho},1\right)$ and $m \mid m_\lambda$.*

(4) *$(A^{(1)},(\rho',\sigma'))$ and $((a/l,b),(\rho,\sigma))$ are regular corners of $(\varphi(P),\varphi(Q))$. The second one is of type IIa).*

Proof. Statements (1) and (2) follows as in the proof of Proposition 5.17. Now we are going to prove item (3). For this we write $\mathfrak{p}(z) = (z-\lambda)^{m_\lambda}\overline{p}(z)$ with $\overline{p}(\lambda) \neq 0$. Since

$$\varphi(z) = \varphi(x^{-\sigma/\rho})\varphi(y) = x^{-\sigma/\rho}(y + \lambda x^{\sigma/\rho}) = z + \lambda,$$

by Proposition 3.8, we have

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \varphi(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = \varphi(x^{k/l}\mathfrak{p}(z)) = x^{k/l}\varphi((z-\lambda)^{m_\lambda}\overline{p}(z)) = x^{k/l}z^{m_\lambda}\overline{p}(z+\lambda),$$

which implies that $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(\varphi(P))$, because

$$\#\,\mathrm{factors}(z^{m_\lambda}\overline{p}(z+\lambda)) = \#\,\mathrm{factors}(\mathfrak{p}(z)) > 1.$$

Moreover, since $\overline{p}(\lambda) \neq 0$, from the first equality in (2.8) it follows that

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = (k/l,0) + m_\lambda(-\sigma/\rho,1),$$

and so statement (3) holds. By statement (2) and Remarks 5.10 and 5.11, in order to prove statement (4) it suffices to verify that $(\rho,\sigma) \in A(\varphi(P))$. Since $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(\varphi(P)) \cap I$ we only must check that

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))) < 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))) < -1. \tag{5.10}$$

Since

$$\frac{k\rho}{l} = v_{\rho,\sigma}\Big(\frac{k}{l},0\Big) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = v_{\rho,\sigma}\Big(\frac{ma}{l},mb\Big) = \frac{m}{l}(a\rho+bl\sigma),$$

by inequality (5.9), we have

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))) = \frac{k}{l} - m_\lambda\left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho}+1\right) \leq \frac{m}{\rho l}(a\rho+bl\sigma) - \frac{m}{l}\left(\frac{a\rho+bl\sigma}{\rho+\sigma}\right)\left(\frac{\rho+\sigma}{\rho}\right) = 0.$$

But $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))) = 0$ is impossible by Theorem 2.6(4), and hence the first inequality in (5.10) holds. We next deal with the second one. By Proposition 3.9,

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(Q))] = 0,$$

while by Proposition 3.8 and Corollary 5.7(1),

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(Q)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) > 0.$$

Hence, by Remark 3.1(2), we have $\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) \in \frac{1}{l'}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0$, and so $m \mid m_\lambda$ and

$$v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma})(\varphi(P)) \leq -m < -1,$$

since $v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))) = m_\lambda \geq 1$, by statement (3). □

Proposition 5.19 (First criterion for regular corners)**.** *If $(a/l, b)$ is the first entry of a regular corner of an (m,n)-pair in $L^{(l)}$, then it is the first entry of a regular corner of an (possibly different) (m,n)-pair in $L^{(l)}$ of type I or type II. Moreover, in the first case $l - a/b > 1$, while in the second one $\gcd(a,b) > 1$. If $l = 1$ then necessarily case II holds.*

Proof. Assume that we are in case III. By Proposition 5.17(3), there exists $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(L^{(l)})$ such that $((a/l, b), (\rho_1, \sigma_1))$ is a regular corner of $(\varphi(P), \varphi(Q))$, where $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) := \mathrm{Pred}_{\varphi(P)}(\rho, \sigma)$. If Case III holds for this corner, then we can find $(\rho_2, \sigma_2) < (\rho_1, \sigma_1)$ such that $((a/l, b), (\rho_2, \sigma_2))$ is a regular corner. As long as Case III occurs, we can find $(\rho_{k+1}, \sigma_{k+1}) < (\rho_k, \sigma_k)$ such that $((a/l, b), (\rho_{k+1}, \sigma_{k+1}))$ is a regular corner. But there are only finitely many ρ_k's with $\rho_k | l$. Moreover, $0 < -\sigma_k < \rho_k$, since $(1,-1) < (\rho_k, \sigma_k) < (1,0)$, and so there are only finitely many (ρ_k, σ_k) possible, which proves that eventually cases I or II must occur. In case I Proposition 5.13 gives $l - a/b > 1$ and in case II, by Proposition 5.14(4), we have $\gcd(a,b) > 1$. The last statement is clear, since $1 - a/b < 1$, because $a, b > 0$. □

Proposition 5.20. *For each (m,n)-pair (P,Q) in $L^{(1)}$, there exists an automorphism φ of $L^{(1)}$ such that $(\varphi(P), \varphi(Q))$ is a standard (m,n)-pair with*

$$v_{1,1}(\varphi(P)) = v_{1,1}(P), \quad v_{1,1}(\varphi(Q)) = v_{1,1}(Q) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\varphi(P)) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P).$$

Moreover, if $(-1,1) < \mathrm{Succ}_P(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_Q(1,0) < (-1,0)$, then

$$(-1,1) < \mathrm{Succ}_{\varphi(P)}(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_{\varphi(Q)}(1,0) < (-1,0).$$

Furthermore, if $P, Q \in L$, then we can take $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$.

Proof. If $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{1,0}(P)) < 0$, then we can take $\varphi := \mathrm{id}$. Otherwise $\left(\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P), (1,0)\right)$ is a regular corner[25]. Write $(a,b) := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$. Case I is impossible because $a, b > 0$ and Proposition 5.13 gives $1 - a/b > 1$, and the Case II.a) is discarded, because $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{1,0}(P)) \geq 0$. By Propositions 5.16 and 5.18 in Case II.b) and by Proposition 5.17 in Case III, we can find a $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(L^{(1)})$ such that

- $\left(\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{1,0}(\varphi(P)), (\rho', \sigma')\right)$ is a regular corner, for some (ρ', σ'),
- $\ell_{1,1}(\varphi(P)) = \ell_{1,1}(P)$, $\ell_{1,1}(\varphi(Q)) = \ell_{1,1}(Q)$ and $\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\varphi(P)) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$,
- If $\mathrm{Succ}_P(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_Q(1,0) < (-1,0)$, then

$$\mathrm{Succ}_{\varphi(P)}(1,0) = \mathrm{Succ}_P(1,0) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{Succ}_{\varphi(Q)}(1,0) = \mathrm{Succ}_Q(1,0).$$

- $\varphi(x) = x$ and $\varphi(y) = y + \lambda$, for some $\lambda \in K^\times$.

The assertions in the statement follow immediately from these facts. □

Corollary 5.21. *If $B < \infty$ (i. e., if the Jacobian conjecture is false), then there exists a Jacobian pair (P,Q) and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ coprime with $m, n > 1$, such that*

(1) (P,Q) *is a standard* (m,n)*-pair in* L*,*
(2) (P,Q) *is a minimal pair (i. e.,* $\gcd\big(v_{1,1}(P), v_{1,1}(Q)\big) = B$*),*
(3) $\mathrm{st}_{1,1}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$*,*
(4) $(-1,1) < \mathrm{Succ}_P(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_Q(1,0) < (-1,0)$.

Proof. By Propositions 3.6, 4.5 and 5.20. □

Proposition 5.22. *Each* (m,n)*-pair* (P,Q) *in* $L^{(l)}$ *has a unique regular corner* $((a/l,b),(\rho,\sigma))$ *with* $(\rho,\sigma) \notin A(P)$.

Proof. If $A(P) \neq \emptyset$, then the existence follows from Remarks 5.10 and 5.11, since

$$\mathrm{Pred}_P(\min(A(P))) \notin A(P).$$

Otherwise, by Proposition 5.4, we know that $(\rho,\sigma) := \mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_1,\sigma_1) \in I$, where

$$(\rho_1,\sigma_1) := \min\big(\mathrm{Succ}_P(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_Q(1,0)\big).$$

Clearly item (2) of Definition 5.5 is fulfilled for $\big(\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P), (\rho,\sigma)\big)$. Moreover, by Proposition 3.6 and Remark 4.4,

$$\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P) \in \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0,$$

and so item (3) is also satisfied. In order to prove item (1) we write $(a/l,b) := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$. By Definition 4.3,

$$a/l - b = v_{1,-1}\left(\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)\right) = v_{1,-1}\left(\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)\right) < 0,$$

while by Remark 4.4, we have $b = -v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) > 1$. This ends the proof of the existence. The uniqueness follows from Proposition 5.2 and the fact that, by Proposition 3.6 and Definition 5.5, if $(A,(\rho,\sigma))$ is a regular corner of (P,Q), then $\mathrm{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma) \in I$ implies that $\mathrm{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$. □

6 Lower bounds

By Corollary 5.21, if $B < \infty$ (i. e., if the Jacobian conjecture is false), then there exists a standard (m,n)-pair (P,Q) in L, which is also a minimal pair (i. e., $\gcd(v_{1,1}(P), v_{1,1}(Q)) = B$). In this section we will first prove that $B \geq 16$. The argument is nearly the same as in [6], but we will also need lower bounds for (m,n)-pairs in $L^{(1)}$, and not only in L. The reason is the following: One technical result, Proposition 6.9, says something about (m,n)-pairs in L with $\frac{1}{m}v_{2,-1}(P) \leq 4$. Via the flip ψ_1 this is the same as saying something about Jacobian pairs in L with $\frac{1}{m}v_{-1,2}(P) \leq 4$. Applying the automorphism ψ_2 defined by $\psi_2(x) := x$ and $\psi_2(y) := x^2y$, this amounts to proving facts about (m,n)-pairs in $L^{(1)}$ with $\frac{1}{m}v_{1,0}(P) \leq 4$, which we will do in the sequel.

Proposition 6.1. *Let* (P,Q) *be a standard* (m,n)*-pair. There exists exactly one regular corner* $((a,b),(\rho,\sigma))$ *of* (P,Q) *of type II.b). Moreover,*

(1) $\sigma < 0$*,*
(2) $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0$ *and* $v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) > 0$*,*
(3) $\frac{v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)}{v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)} = \frac{m}{n}$*,*
(4) $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = 0$*,*
(5) $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q)$*,*



FIGURE 3. Applying ψ_1 and ψ_2 to elements P with $v_{2,-1}(P) \leq 4$.

(6) *There exists* $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$ *greater than* 0 *such that*

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \frac{\mu}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P),$$

where $F \in L^{(1)}$ *is the* (ρ,σ)*-homogeneous element obtained in Theorem 2.6,*

(7) $v_{1,-1}\big(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)\big) < 0$ *and* $v_{1,-1}\big(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)\big) < 0$,

(8) $\frac{v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)}{v_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q)} = \frac{m}{n}$ *for all* $(\rho,\sigma) < (\rho',\sigma') < (1,0)$,

(9) $v_{1,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \leq v_{1,1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P))$,

Proof. The uniqueness follows immediately from the definition of $A(P)$ and Proposition 5.22. The same proposition yields a regular corner $((a,b),(\rho,\sigma))$ such that

$$(\rho,\sigma) \notin A(P). \tag{6.1}$$

Statements (2), (3) and (5) follow now from Corollary 5.7. By Remark 5.8 we have $1 - a/b < 1$. Hence, by Proposition 5.13 we are in case II or in case III, and so statement (4) holds. Furthermore, by Remark 3.1 we have

$$\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \frac{1}{n}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q),$$

which implies $\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0$. We will prove that

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) > 0. \tag{6.2}$$

Assume by contradiction that $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \leq 0$, which implies $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < 0$, by Theorem 2.6(4). If $v_{0,-1}(\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \leq -1$ then $(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$, which contradicts (6.1). Hence $v_{0,-1}(\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = 0$, and so $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = (k,0)$, for some $k < 0$. But then

$$0 < v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \rho k < 0,$$

a contradiction which proves (6.2). This implies statement (1) since, by the definition of standard (m,n)-pair, $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{1,0}(P)) < 0$.

Assume that $((a,b),(\rho,\sigma))$ is of type III. Then, by Proposition 5.17, we know that $\rho|l = 1$, and so $(\rho,\sigma) = (1,0)$, which contradicts statement (1). Hence, by inequality (6.2), we are in case II.b).

Statement (6) follows from items (1) and (4) of Proposition 5.14. Statement (7) for P follows from Definition 5.5, and then it follows for Q, by Corollary 5.7(2).

By Proposition 3.6 and Definition 5.5, if $\mathrm{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma) \in I$, then $\mathrm{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$. Consequently, by Proposition 5.2,

$$\mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap\,](\rho,\sigma),(1,0)] \subseteq A(P).$$

Statement (8) now follows easily from Proposition 3.6, Remark 3.1 and the fact that, by Proposition 5.4, statement (3) holds for all $(\rho_j,\sigma_j) \in A(P)$. Finally, by Proposition 3.6 and Remark 1.8,

$$v_{1,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) = v_{1,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(P)) < v_{1,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(P))$$

for consecutive directions $(\rho',\sigma') < (\rho'',\sigma'')$ in $\mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap I$, from which statement (9) follows. □

Definition 6.2. The *starting triple* of a standard (m,n)-pair (P,Q) is $(A_0, A_0', (\rho,\sigma))$, where $(A_0,(\rho,\sigma))$ is the unique regular corner of (P,Q) with $(\rho,\sigma) \notin A(P)$, and $A_0' = \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$. The point A_0 is called the *primitive corner* of (P,Q).

Remark 6.3. By Propositions 5.22 and 6.1 and Remark 5.10, in the previous definition $(A_0,(\rho,\sigma))$ is the unique regular corner of type II.b). Consequently $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) > 0$.

Let (P,Q) be a standard (m,n)-pair and $(A_0, A_0', (\rho,\sigma))$ its starting triple. Let λ and m_λ be as in Proposition 5.16, let $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(L^{(\rho)})$ and $A^{(1)}$ be as in Proposition 5.18 and let F be as in Proposition 5.14. Note that $F \in L$. In fact, for $(i,j) \in \mathrm{Supp}(F)$, we have

$$\rho i + \sigma j = v_{\rho,\sigma}(i,j) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \rho + \sigma > 0,$$

which implies that $i \geq 0$, since $\rho > 0$, $\sigma < 0$ and $j \geq 0$. Write

$$(f_1,f_2) := \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F), \quad (u,v) := A_0, \quad (r',s') := A_0' \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma := \frac{m_\lambda}{m}.$$



FIGURE 4. Illustration of Proposition 6.4.

Proposition 6.4. *It is true that* $A_0, A_0' \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ *and* $v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0')$. *Moreover,*

(1) $s' < r' < u < v$,
(2) $2 \leq f_1 < u$,
(3) $\gcd(u,v) > 1$,
(4) $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \mu A_0$ *for some* $0 < \mu < 1$,

(5) $uf_2 = vf_1$ *and* $\rho \leq u$,

(6) $(\rho,\sigma) = \operatorname{dir}(f_1 - 1, f_2 - 1) = \left(\frac{f_2-1}{d}, \frac{1-f_1}{d}\right)$, *where* $d := \gcd(f_1 - 1, f_2 - 1)$,

(7) $A^{(1)} = A'_0 + (\gamma - s')\left(-\frac{\sigma}{\rho}, 1\right)$,

(8) *If* $A^{(1)} = (a'/\rho, b')$, *then* $\rho - a'/b' > 1$ *or* $\gcd(a', b') > 1$,

(9) $\gamma \leq (v - s')/\rho$. *Moreover, if* $d = \gcd(f_1 - 1, f_2 - 1) = 1$, *then* $\gamma = (v - s')/\rho$.

Proof. By statements (2), (3) and (4) of Proposition 6.1 and statement (2b) of Proposition 2.1, there exist $\lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in K^\times$ and a (ρ,σ)-homogeneous element $R \in L^{(1)}$ such that

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \lambda_P R^m \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = \lambda_P R^n. \tag{6.3}$$

This implies that

$$A_0 = \operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R) \qquad \text{and} \qquad A'_0 = \operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(R).$$

Hence, $v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(A'_0)$. Moreover, the same argument given above for F shows that $R \in L$, and so $A_0, A'_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$

Statement (1) follows from the fact that, by inequality (6.2) and Proposition 6.1(7)

$$v_{1,-1}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{1,-1}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) > 0,$$

and, by Remark 1.8,

$$v_{1,0}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < v_{1,0}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)), \tag{6.4}$$

since $(1,-1) < (\rho,\sigma) < (1,0)$. Proposition 6.1(6) gives statement (4) except the inequality $\mu < 1$. But this is true because $\mu \geq 1$ implies

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(A'_0) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0) = \frac{1}{\mu} v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \leq v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \rho + \sigma,$$

which is is impossible since, by statement (1) and Proposition 6.1(1),

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(A'_0) = r'\rho + s'\sigma = (r' - s')\rho + s'(\rho + \sigma) \geq (r' - s')\rho \geq \rho > \rho + \sigma.$$

We claim that $v_{1,0}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) \geq 1$. In fact, otherwise $\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (0, h)$ for some $h \in \mathbb{N}_0$, which implies $v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \sigma h \leq 0$. But this is impossible since $v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \rho + \sigma > 0$. Hence, by Remark 1.8,

$$f_1 = v_{1,0}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) > v_{1,0}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) \geq 1,$$

which combined with $f_1 = \mu u$ and $0 < \mu < 1$ proves statement (2). Moreover, if $\gcd(u, v) = 1$, then there is no $\mu \in]0, 1[$ such that $\mu(u, v) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$, and so statement (3) is true. Next we prove statement (5). From statement (4) it follows that $uf_2 = vf_1$. Equivalently $u(f_1, f_2) = f_1(u, v)$, and so

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(f_1 A'_0) = f_1 v_{\rho,\sigma}(A'_0) = f_1 v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0) = u v_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = u v_{\rho,\sigma}(1, 1) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(u, u).$$

Hence there exists $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f_1 A'_0 = (u, u) - t(-\sigma, \rho)$. Thus

$$u - t\rho = v_{0,1}(f_1 A'_0) = f_1 v_{0,1}(A'_0) \geq 0,$$

and so $u \geq t\rho$. Therefore, in order to finish the proof of statement (5) we only must note that $t \leq 0$ is impossible, because it implies $f_1 v_{1,-1}(A'_0) \leq 0$, contradicting Remark 6.3.

The first equality in statement (6) follows from the fact that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(f_1, f_2) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(1, 1)$ and Remark 3.2. So, by (3.2)

$$(\rho,\sigma) = \pm\left(\frac{f_2 - 1}{d}, \frac{1 - f_1}{d}\right),$$

where $d := \gcd(f_1-1, f_2-1)$. Since $\rho+\sigma > 0$ and, by statements (1) and (4), we have $f_2-f_1 > 0$, necessarily

$$(\rho, \sigma) = \left(\frac{f_2-1}{d}, \frac{1-f_1}{d}\right),$$

which ends the proof of statement (6). Next we prove statement (7). The point $A^{(1)}$ is completely determined by $v_{0,1}(A^{(1)})$ and $v_{\rho,\sigma}(A^{(1)})$. Let φ be as in Proposition 5.18. Since

$$v_{0,1}\left(A'_0 + (\gamma - s')\left(-\frac{\sigma}{\rho}, 1\right)\right) = \gamma = v_{0,1}(A^{(1)})$$

by Proposition 5.18(3), and

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}\left(A'_0 + (\gamma - s')\left(-\frac{\sigma}{\rho}, 1\right)\right) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(A'_0) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(A^{(1)})$$

because φ is (ρ, σ)-homogeneous, statement (7) is true. Statement (8) follows directly from Propositions 5.18(4) and 5.19. It remains to prove statement (9). Write $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = x^r y^s p(z)$, where $z = x^{-\sigma/\rho}y$ and $p(0) \neq 0$. Since $R \in L$ and $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \lambda_P R^m$, we have $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \in L$, which implies $p(z) \in K[x, y]$. Hence

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = x^r y^s \overline{p}(z^\rho), \quad \text{where } \overline{p}(z^\rho) \in K[z^\rho].$$

By Proposition 5.16 we know that $\lambda \neq 0$, so m_λ is the multiplicity of a root of $p(z)$. Since the multiplicities of the roots of $p(z)$ are the same as the multiplicities of the roots of $\overline{p}(z)$, we have $m_\lambda \leq \deg(\overline{p})$. Combining this with Remark 2.8, we obtain

$$m_\lambda \leq \deg(\overline{p}) = \frac{v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) - v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P))}{\rho} = m\left(\frac{v-s'}{\rho}\right),$$

which proves the first part of statement (9). We claim that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (1, 1)$. In fact, otherwise

$$(\alpha, \beta) := \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (1 - \sigma i, 1 + \rho i), \qquad \text{with } i > 0.$$

Note that $\alpha < \beta$, since $\rho > -\sigma$. But this is impossible because $r' > s'$, and, by Theorem 2.6(2), we have

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) \sim \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = m(r', s').$$

Consequently, if $d = 1$, then by statement (6)

$$v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) - v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)) = f_2 - 1 = \rho,$$

and so, by Proposition 2.10(4),

$$m_\lambda = \frac{1}{\rho}\left(v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) - v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P))\right) = \frac{m(v-s')}{\rho},$$

as desired. □

Proposition 6.5. *If A_0 is as before Proposition 6.4, then $v_{1,1}(A_0) \geq 16$.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.4 it suffices to prove that there is no pair $A_0 = (u, v)$ with $u + v \leq 15$, for which there exist (f_1, f_2), $A'_0 = (r', s')$, γ and $A^{(1)}$, such that all the conditions of that proposition are satisfied. In Table 1 we first list all possible pairs (u, v) with $v > u > 2$, $\gcd(u, v) > 1$ and $u + v \leq 15$. We also list all the possible $(f_1, f_2) = \mu(u, v)$ with $f_1 \geq 2$ and $0 < \mu < 1$. Then we compute the corresponding (ρ, σ) using Proposition 6.4(6) and we verify if there is an $A'_0 := (r', s')$ with $s' < r' < u$ and $v_{\rho,\sigma}(u, v) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(r', s')$. This happens in five cases. In all these cases $d := \gcd(f_1 - 1, f_2 - 1) = 1$. Then, by Proposition 6.4(9), we have $\gamma = (v - s')/\rho$. Using these values, we compute $A^{(1)}$ in each of the five cases using statement (7) of the same proposition. Finally we verify that in none of this cases condition (8) of Proposition 6.4 is satisfied, concluding the proof. □

A_0	(f_1, f_2)	(ρ, σ)	A_0'	d	γ	$A^{(1)}$
(3,6)	(2,4)	(3,-1)	(1,0)	1	2	$\left(\frac{5}{3}, 2\right)$
(3,9)	(2,6)	(5,-1)	×			
(3,12)	(2,8)	(7,-1)	×			
(4,6)	(2,3)	(2,-1)	(1,0)	1	3	$\left(\frac{5}{2}, 3\right)$
(4,8)	(2,4)	(3,-1)	×			
(4,8)	(3,6)	(5,-2)	×			
(4,10)	(2,5)	(4,-1)	×			
(5,10)	(2,4)	(3,-1)	(2,1)	1	3	$\left(\frac{8}{3}, 3\right)$
(5,10)	(3,6)	(5,-2)	(1,0)	1	2	$\left(\frac{9}{5}, 2\right)$
(5,10)	(4,8)	(7,-3)	×			
(6,8)	(3,4)	(3,-2)	×			
(6,9)	(2,3)	(2,-1)	(2,1)	1	4	$\left(\frac{7}{2}, 4\right)$
(6,9)	(4,6)	(5,-3)	×			

TABLE 1

Corollary 6.6. *We have $B \geq 16$.*

Proof. Suppose $B < \infty$ and take (P, Q) and (m, n) as in Corollary 5.21. Assume that (ρ, σ) and A_0 are as above Proposition 6.4. By Proposition 6.5,

$$B = \gcd\big(v_{1,1}(P), v_{1,1}(Q)\big) = \frac{1}{m} v_{1,1}(P) \geq \frac{1}{m} v_{1,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = v_{1,1}(A_0) \geq 16,$$

as desired. □

Proposition 6.7. *Let (P, Q) be a standard (m, n)-pair and let $A_0 = (u, v)$ be as before Proposition 6.4. Then $v \leq u(u-1)$ and $u \geq 4$.*

Proof. Let F, $(f_1, f_2) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F)$ and $d = \gcd(f_1 - 1, f_2 - 1)$ be as before Proposition 6.4. By statements (5) and (6) of Proposition 6.4,

$$\frac{f_1 v - u}{du} = \frac{f_2 - 1}{d} = \rho \leq u.$$

Hence

$$v \leq \frac{du^2 + u}{f_1} = u\frac{du + 1}{f_1} \leq u\frac{(f_1 - 1)u + 1}{f_1} = u\frac{f_1 u - (u-1)}{f_1} = u\left(u - \frac{u-1}{f_1}\right) \leq u(u-1),$$

where the last inequality follows from Proposition 6.4(2). Again by Proposition 6.4(2), we know that $u \geq 3$, so we must only check that the case $u = 3$ is impossible. But if $A_0 = (3, v)$, then by the first statement necessarily $v \leq 6$, which contradicts Proposition 6.5. □

Remark 6.8. The inequality $u \geq 4$ is related to [7, Proposition 2.22]. It shows that for a standard (m, n)-pair (P, Q), the greatest common divisor of $\deg_x(P) = v_{1,0}(P)$ and $\deg_x(Q) = v_{1,0}(Q)$ is greater than or equal to 4. Using similar techniques as in the proof of Proposition 4.5, one can prove that this inequality holds for any counterexample.

Let $\psi_1 \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ be the map defined by $\psi_1(x) := y$ and $\psi_1(y) := -x$. Since $[\psi_1(x), \psi_1(y)] = 1$, by Proposition 3.9, this map preserves Jacobian pairs. Moreover, the action induced by ψ_1 on the Newton polygon of a polynomial P is the orthogonal reflection at the main diagonal, and so, it maps edges of the convex hull of $\mathrm{Supp}(P)$ into edges of the convex hull of $\mathrm{Supp}(\psi_1(P))$, interchanging st and en.

Similarly the automorphism ψ_2 of $L^{(1)}$, defined by $\psi_2(x) := -x^{-1}$ and $\psi_2(y) := x^2y$ preserves Jacobian pairs and it induces on the Newton polygon of each $P \in L^{(1)}$ a reflection at the main diagonal, parallel to the X-axis . Hence it also maps edges of the convex hull of $\mathrm{Supp}(P)$ into edges of the convex hull of $\mathrm{Supp}(\psi_2(P))$, interchanging st and en.

Moreover, an elementary computation shows that if we define

$$\overline{\psi}_1(\rho, \sigma) := (\sigma, \rho) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\psi}_2(\rho, \sigma) := (-\rho, 2\rho + \sigma), \tag{6.5}$$

and set $(\rho_k, \sigma_k) := \overline{\psi}_k(\rho, \sigma)$ for $k = 1, 2$, then

$$v_{\rho_k,\sigma_k}(\psi_k(P)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho_k,\sigma_k}(\psi_k(P)) = \psi_k(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)), \tag{6.6}$$

for all $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$ and $P \in L^{(1)}$ (when $k = 1$ we assume $P \in L$).

Proposition 6.9. *Let (P, Q) be a standard (m, n)-pair in L and let (ρ, σ) and A_0 be as before Proposition 6.4. If $(\rho, \sigma) = (2, -1)$, then it is impossible that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0) \leq 3$ or that $A_0 = (8, 12)$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi\colon L \to L^{(1)}$ be the morphism defined by $\varphi := \psi_2 \circ \psi_1$. Write $\mathrm{en}_{2,-1}(P) = (a, b)$, so that $A_0 = \frac{1}{m}(a, b)$. We claim that $\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\varphi(P)) = (2a - b, a)$. In order to prove the claim, note first that

$$\overline{\psi}_1(-1, 1) = (1, -1), \quad \overline{\psi}_1(2, -1) = (-1, 2), \quad \overline{\psi}_2(-1, 2) = (1, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\psi}_2(1, -1) = (-1, 1).$$

Since, by Remark 1.8,

$$\mathrm{Supp}\big(\ell_{-1,1}(\ell_{2,-1}(P))\big) = \mathrm{en}_{2,-1}(P) = (a, b),$$

and, by the second equality in (6.6),

$$\ell_{-1,1}(\ell_{1,0}(\varphi(P))) = \ell_{-1,1}(\psi_2(\ell_{-1,2}(\psi_1(P)))) = \psi_2(\ell_{1,-1}(\psi_1(\ell_{2,-1}P))) = \varphi(\ell_{-1,1}(\ell_{2,-1}(P))),$$

we have, again by Remark 1.8,

$$\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\varphi(P)) = \mathrm{Supp}(\varphi(x^a y^b)) = (2a - b, a),$$

which proves the claim. Moreover, $(\varphi(P), \varphi(Q))$ is an (m, n)-pair, because by Proposition 3.9, we have $[\varphi(P), \varphi(Q)] = 1$; it is true that

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\varphi(P))) = a - b = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{2,-1}(P)) < 0;$$

and, by the first equality in (6.6), statements (3) and (8) of Proposition 6.1, and the fact that $\overline{\psi}_2(\overline{\psi}_1(2, -1)) = (1, 0)$ and $\overline{\psi}_2(\overline{\psi}_1(3, -1)) = (1, 1)$, we have

$$\frac{v_{1,0}(\varphi(P))}{v_{1,0}(\varphi(Q))} = \frac{v_{2,-1}(P)}{v_{2,-1}(Q)} = \frac{m}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{v_{1,1}(\varphi(P))}{v_{1,1}(\varphi(Q))} = \frac{v_{3,-1}(P)}{v_{3,-1}(Q)} = \frac{m}{n}.$$

Applying Proposition 5.20 we obtain a standard (m, n)-pair $(\widetilde{P}, \widetilde{Q})$ with

$$\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\widetilde{P}) = \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\varphi(P)) = \frac{1}{m}(2a - b, a).$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{m}v_{1,0}(\widetilde{P}) = \frac{1}{m}v_{1,0}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\widetilde{P})) = \frac{1}{m}(2a - b) = \frac{1}{m}v_{2,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{2,-1}(P)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0).$$

Let $\widetilde{A}_0 = (u, v)$ be the primitive corner of $(\widetilde{P}, \widetilde{Q})$. Since $m(u, v) \in \mathrm{Supp}(\widetilde{P})$, we have

$$u \leq \frac{1}{m} v_{1,0}(\widetilde{P}) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0).$$

So, if $v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0) \leq 3$, then $u \leq 3$, which contradicts Proposition 6.7. If $\frac{1}{m}(a, b) = A_0 = (8, 12)$, then, by Proposition 6.1(9), we have

$$v_{1,1}(\widetilde{A}_0) \leq \frac{1}{m} v_{1,1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(\widetilde{P})) = v_{1,1}(4, 8) = 12,$$

which is impossible by Proposition 6.5. □

7 More conditions on B

In this section we prove that $B = 16$ or $B > 20$, and that $B \neq 2p$ for all prime p. The first result can be inferred from [7, Theorem 2.24], whose proof is hidden behind a computer search. We give a complete proof, without the use of a computer. Abhyankar allegedly developed a proof of the second result according to [7, Page 50], but we could not find any published article of Abhyankar with such proof. Heitmann says that it is possible to adapt the proof of [7, Proposition 2.21] to prove $B \neq 2p$, however we were not able to do this. On the other hand this is also claimed to be proven in [15, Theorem 4.12]. But the proof relies on [15, Lemma 4.10], which has a gap, since it claims without proof that $I_2 \subseteq \frac{1}{m}\Gamma(f_2)$, an assertion which cannot be proven to be true. The main technical results in this section are Propositions 7.1 and 7.3, together with its Corollaries 7.2 and 7.4. They are closely related to [12, Propositions 6.3 and 6.4] and seem to be a generalization of them. These results are interesting on their own, but they also allow to establish a very strong criterion for the possible regular corners (Theorem 7.6) which leads to the proof of $B \neq 2p$. Another application of these results is the generalization of the reduction of degree technique of Moh, which we apply to the case $B = 16$ in the last section. In the present section we also describe in Corollary 7.13 the shape of a possible counterexample to the Jacobian conjecture in the case $B = 16$.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ be coprime with $m, n > 1$ and let $P, Q \in L^{(l)}$ with*

$$[P, Q] \in K^\times \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{v_{1,1}(P)}{v_{1,1}(Q)} = \frac{v_{1,0}(P)}{v_{1,0}(Q)} = \frac{m}{n},$$

Take $T_0 \in K[P, Q]$ and set $T_j := [T_{j-1}, P]$ for $j \geq 1$. Assume that $(\rho_0, \sigma_0) \in \mathfrak{V}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies

1. *$v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P) > 0$,*
2. *$\mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(T_j) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)$ for all j with $T_j \neq 0$,*
3. *$\frac{1}{m}\mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P) = \frac{1}{n}\mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q) \in \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$,*
4. *$b > a/l$, where $(a/l, b) := \frac{1}{m}\mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)$.*

Let $I_0 := [(\rho_0, \sigma_0), (0, -1)[$ and

$$(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma}) := \max\{(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap I_0 : v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) > 0 \text{ for all } (\rho_0, \sigma_0) \leq (\rho', \sigma') \leq (\rho, \sigma)\}$$

Then for all $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$ with $(\rho_0, \sigma_0) < (\rho, \sigma) \leq (\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma})$ and all $j \geq 0$ we have

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(T_j), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{v_{\rho,\sigma}(T_j)}{v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)} = \frac{v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(T_j)}{v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)}. \tag{7.1}$$

Idea of the proof: We must prove that there is a partial homothety between P and T_j for $(\rho, \sigma) > (\rho_0, \sigma_0)$. The basic idea is that otherwise $\mathrm{en}(T_{j+n}) \nsim \mathrm{en}(P)$ for some direction and all $n > 0$, and then $T_{j+n} \neq 0$ for all $n > 0$, which is impossible.

Proof. Let

$$(\rho_1,\sigma_1)<\cdots<(\rho_k,\sigma_k)=(\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma})$$

be the directions in $\mathrm{Dir}(P)$ between (ρ_0,σ_0) and $(\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma})$. We will use freely that $v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)>0$ for all $(\rho_0,\sigma_0)\leq(\rho',\sigma')\leq(\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma})$. By Remark 1.15 and conditions (2), (3) and (4), we have

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P))<0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(T_j)=\mu_j\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P) \quad \text{with } \mu_j\geq 0, \tag{7.2}$$

for all j with $T_j\neq 0$. We claim that if

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P))<0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(T_j)=\mu_j\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P) \quad \text{with } \mu_j\geq 0, \tag{7.3}$$

for some $0\leq i<k$ and all j with $T_j\neq 0$, then

(a) $\mathrm{Succ}_{T_j}(\rho_i,\sigma_i)\geq(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1})$, for all j with $T_j\neq 0$,
(b) $[\ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j),\ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P)]=0$, for all j.

In order to check this, we write

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P)=r_i(a_i/l,b_i) \quad \text{with } r_i\geq 0 \text{ and } \gcd(a_i,b_i)=1.$$

By (3.2) and the inequality in (7.3), we have

$$(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}):=\mathrm{dir}(a_i/l,b_i)=\frac{1}{d}(lb_i,-a_i), \quad \text{where } d:=\gcd(lb_i,a_i).$$

Furthermore $r_i\in\mathbb{N}$, since $\gcd(a_i,b_i)=1$ and $\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P)\neq(0,0)$. Note that

$$(c,d)\sim(a_i/l,b_i) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(c,d)=0. \tag{7.4}$$

Next we prove

$$(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma})<(\rho_i,\sigma_i)<(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1})<(-\overline{\rho},-\overline{\sigma}). \tag{7.5}$$

For this, first note that $(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma})\in\,]{(1,-1)},{(0,1)}]$, since $b_i\geq 0$ and $\overline{\rho}+\overline{\sigma}>0$ by the inequality in (7.3). Note also that $(\rho_i,\sigma_i)\in[(\rho_0,\sigma_0),(0,-1)[\ \subset\ ]{(1,-1)},{(0,-1)}[$. Hence, since

$$(lb_i,-a_i)\times(\rho_i,\sigma_i)=\rho_ia_i+\sigma_ilb_i=lv_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(a_i/l,b_i)=\frac{l}{r_i}v_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P)>0, \tag{7.6}$$

necessarily, with the order in $]{(1,-1)},{(0,-1)}[$, we have

$$(\rho_i,\sigma_i)>(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}).$$

Otherwise $(\rho_i,\sigma_i),(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma})\in\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$, which implies $(lb_i,-a_i)\times(\rho_i,\sigma_i)\leq 0$ and contradicts (7.6). The second inequality of (7.5) is clear. On the other hand, the inequality

$$(-lb_i,a_i)\times(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1})=-lv_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(a_i/l,b_i)=-\frac{l}{r_i}v_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P)<0, \tag{7.7}$$

yields

$$(-\overline{\rho},-\overline{\sigma})>(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}) \quad \text{in} \quad]{(-1,1)},{(0,-1)}].$$

Otherwise, since

$$(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1})\in\,]{(\rho_0,\sigma_0)},{(0,-1)}[\,\subset\,]{(1,-1)},{(0,-1)}[\quad \text{and} \quad (-\overline{\rho},-\overline{\sigma})\in\,]{(-1,1)},{(0,-1)}],$$

the inequality $(-\overline{\rho},-\overline{\sigma})\leq(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1})$ would lead to $(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}),(-\overline{\rho},-\overline{\sigma})\in\mathfrak{V}_{<0}$, and then to $(-lb_i,a_i)\times(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1})\geq 0$, which contradicts (7.7). This finishes the proof of (7.5).

Next we prove condition (a). Take $T_j\neq 0$ and assume by contradiction that

$$(\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}):=\mathrm{Succ}_{T_j}(\rho_i,\sigma_i)<(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}),$$

which by (7.5) implies

$$(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma})<(\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma})<(-\overline{\rho},-\overline{\sigma}). \tag{7.8}$$

By Remark 1.8 and (7.4), we have

$$v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_j))<v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{st}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_j))=0, \tag{7.9}$$

since $(a_i/l, b_i) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(T_j) = \mathrm{st}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_j)$, by (7.3). We assert that

$$T_{j+k} \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_{j+k}) = \mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_j) + k\,\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P) - k(1,1), \tag{7.10}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We will prove this by induction on k. For $k = 0$ this is trivial. Assume that (7.10) is true for some k. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_{j+k})) &= v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_j)) + k v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P)) - k v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(1,1) \\ &= v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_j)) - k(\overline{\rho} + \overline{\sigma}) \\ &< 0, \end{aligned}$$

since $v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P)) = v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P)) = 0$ by Proposition 3.6 and (7.4), $v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_j)) < 0$ by (7.9), and $\overline{\rho} + \overline{\sigma} > 0$. But then, again by (7.4),

$$\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_{j+k}) \nsim \mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P) = r_i(a_i/l, b_i).$$

Hence, by Propositions 1.13 and 2.3

$$\ell_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_{j+k+1}) = [\ell_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_{j+k}), \ell_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P)] \neq 0.$$

Consequently, by Proposition 2.4(2) and (7.10) for k,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_{j+k+1}) &= \mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_{j+k}) + \mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P) - (1,1) \\ &= \mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(T_j) + (k+1)\,\mathrm{en}_{\hat{\rho},\hat{\sigma}}(P) - (k+1)(1,1), \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof of the assertion. But $T_{j+k} \neq 0$ for all k is impossible, since from $[P, Q] \in K^\times$ and $T_0 \in K[P, Q]$ it follows easily that $T_n = 0$ for n large enough. Therefore statement (a) is true.

Now we are going to prove statement (b). Assume by contradiction that

$$[\ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j), \ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P)] \neq 0,$$

which by Proposition 1.13 implies

$$[\ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j), \ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P)] = \ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}([T_j, P]) = \ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_{j+1}). \tag{7.11}$$

By (7.5) we have $(\overline{\rho}, \overline{\sigma}) < (\rho_{i+1}, \sigma_{i+1}) < (-\overline{\rho}, -\overline{\sigma})$ and so, by Remark 1.8

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P) &= \mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P))), \\ \mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j) &= \mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j))), \\ \mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_{j+1}) &= \mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_{j+1}))). \end{aligned}$$

But then, by Proposition 1.13 and equivalence (7.4),

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_{j+1})) &= v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_{j+1})) \\ &\leq v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j)) + v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\ell_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P)) - (\overline{\rho} + \overline{\sigma}) \\ &= v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j)) + v_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P)) - (\overline{\rho} + \overline{\sigma}) \\ &= -(\overline{\rho} + \overline{\sigma}) < 0, \end{aligned}$$

since by item (a), Proposition 3.6 and (7.3),

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(T_j) \sim (a_i/l, b_i) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P).$$

Hence, by item (a), Proposition 3.6 and (7.4),

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(T_{j+1}) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_{j+1}) \nsim (a_i/l, b_i) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P),$$

which contradicts (7.3), thus proving (b) and finishing the proof of the claim.

In order to prove (7.1), we must check that

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(T_j), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{v_{\rho,\sigma}(T_j)}{v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)} = \frac{v_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(T_j)}{v_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P)} \tag{7.12}$$

hold for all (ρ,σ) with $(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}) \geq (\rho,\sigma) > (\rho_i,\sigma_i)$ and all i. We proceed by induction, using the claim and (7.2). More precisely, we are going to prove for any i, that (7.3) implies that (7.12) hold for all (ρ,σ) with $(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}) \geq (\rho,\sigma) > (\rho_i,\sigma_i)$, and that condition (7.3) is true for $i+1$.

In fact, if $(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}) > (\rho,\sigma) > (\rho_i,\sigma_i)$, then by Proposition 3.6,

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P) = \mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P), \tag{7.13}$$

while, again by Proposition 3.6 and statement (a), for the same (ρ,σ)

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(T_j) = \mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(T_j)) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j). \tag{7.14}$$

Consequently, since $\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(T_j) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P)$,

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(T_j), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0 \qquad \text{for all } (\rho,\sigma) \text{ with } (\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}) > (\rho,\sigma) > (\rho_i,\sigma_i)$$

and

$$\frac{v_{\rho,\sigma}(T_j)}{v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)} = \frac{v_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(T_j)}{v_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P)} \qquad \text{for all } (\rho,\sigma) \text{ with } (\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}) \geq (\rho,\sigma) > (\rho_i,\sigma_i).$$

Hence the equalities in (7.12) hold for all required (ρ,σ)'s. Next we prove that condition (7.3) is true for $i+1$. We first prove that

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P)) < 0. \tag{7.15}$$

If $\rho_{i+1}+\sigma_{i+1} \geq 0$, then by Proposition 3.6, Remark 1.8 and the inequality in (7.3),

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P)) \leq v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P)) = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P)) < 0,$$

as desired. Assume that $\rho_{i+1}+\sigma_{i+1} < 0$ and set $A := \mathrm{en}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P)$. First we are going to prove that $v_{1,-1}(A) \neq 0$. Otherwise $A = k(1,1)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, which is impossible, since then

$$v_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P) = v_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(A) = k(\rho_{i+1}+\sigma_{i+1}) \leq 0,$$

contradicting the definition of $(\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma})$. Assume that

$$v_{1,-1}(A) > 0 = v_{1,-1}(0,0). \tag{7.16}$$

Since $\rho_{i+1}+\sigma_{i+1} < 0$, $(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}) \in I_0$ and $A \in \mathrm{Supp}(P)$, we have

$$(-1,1) < (\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}) < (0,-1) \quad \text{and} \quad v_{0,1}(A) \geq 0 = v_{0,1}(0,0).$$

Thus, by Corollary 3.5 (which we can apply because $(-\rho_{i+1},-\sigma_{i+1}) < (0,1)$ in $\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$), we have

$$v_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P) = v_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(A) = -v_{-\rho_{i+1},-\sigma_{i+1}}(A) < -v_{-\rho_{i+1},-\sigma_{i+1}}(0,0) = 0,$$

which contradicts again the definition of $(\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma})$ and ends the proof of (7.15).

It remains to check that the second assertion in (7.3) holds for $i+1$. By equalities (7.13) and (7.14),

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(T_j) = \mu_j\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(P) = \mu_j\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P),$$

which implies $v_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j) = \mu_j v_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P) \geq 0$. Therefore, by (b), we can apply Remark 3.1 in order to obtain that

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(T_j) = \mu_j\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1}}(P),$$

as desired. This proves (7.1) and concludes the proof. □

Corollary 7.2. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ be coprime with $m, n > 1$ and let $P, Q \in L^{(l)}$ with*

$$[P, Q] \in K^\times \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{v_{1,1}(P)}{v_{1,1}(Q)} = \frac{v_{1,0}(P)}{v_{1,0}(Q)} = \frac{m}{n}.$$

Assume that $(\rho_0, \sigma_0) \in \mathfrak{V}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies

(1) $v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P) > 0$,
(2) $\frac{1}{m} \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P) = \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q) \in \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$,
(3) $b > a/l$, *where* $(a/l, b) := \frac{1}{m} \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)$.

Let $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma})$ be as in Proposition 7.1 and let $F \in L^{(l)}$ be the (ρ_0, σ_0)-homogeneous element obtained in Theorem 2.6. If there exist $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ coprime such that $\operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(F) = \frac{p}{q}(a/l, b)$, then for all $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$ with $(\rho_0, \sigma_0) < (\rho, \sigma) \leq (\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma})$ there exists a (ρ, σ)-homogeneous element $R \in L^{(l)}$ such that $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = R^{qm}$.

Proof. Let G_0 and G_1 be as in Theorem 2.6. Since $G_0, P \neq 0$, by the last equality in (2.7) we have

$$[\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_0), \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)] \neq 0,$$

which, by Proposition 1.13, implies that

$$\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_1) = [\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_0), \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)] \neq 0.$$

By Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 2.6(5) there exists $g_1 \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_1) = g_1 \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P). \tag{7.17}$$

Moreover,

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(F) = \frac{p}{q}(a/l, b) = \frac{p}{qm} \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P). \tag{7.18}$$

On the other hand, using again the last equality in (2.7), we obtain

$$\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_1)F = \ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_0)\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P),$$

and hence

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_1) + \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(F) = \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_0) + \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P).$$

Consequently, by (7.17) and (7.18),

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_0) = \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_1) + \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(F) - \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P) = \Big(g_1 + \frac{p}{qm} - 1\Big) \operatorname{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P).$$

Set $g_0 := g_1 + \frac{p}{qm} - 1$ and take $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$ coprime, such that $g_0 = r/s$. Note that by (7.17), (7.18) and the fact that $g_1 = \frac{r}{s} + 1 - \frac{p}{qm}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)}\big(v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_0), v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_1), v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P), v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q)\big) = \left(\frac{r}{s}, \frac{r}{s} + 1 - \frac{p}{qm}, 1, \frac{n}{m}\right). \tag{7.19}$$

Let $(\rho, \sigma) > (\rho_0, \sigma_0)$. Applying Proposition 7.1 with $T_0 := G_0$, with $T_0 := G_1$ and with $T_0 := Q$, we obtain that

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0, \quad [\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_1), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)] = 0.$$

Hence, by Proposition 2.1(2b), there exist $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \in K^\times$, a (ρ, σ)-homogeneous element $R_0 \in L$ and $u_0, u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0) = \gamma_0 R_0^{u_0}, \quad \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_1) = \gamma_1 R_0^{u_1}, \quad \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \gamma_2 R_0^{u_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = \gamma_3 R_0^{u_3}, \text{[26]}$$

and clearly we can assume that $\gcd(u_0,u_1,u_2,u_3)=1$[27]. But then, by Proposition 7.1 and equality (7.19),

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\rho,\sigma}(R_0)(u_0,u_1,u_2,u_3) &= \big(v_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0), v_{\rho,\sigma}(G_1), v_{\rho,\sigma}(P), v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)\big) \\ &= \frac{v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)}{v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)}\big(v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_0), v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(G_1), v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P), v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q)\big) \\ &= \frac{v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)}{sqm}(rqm, rqm+sqm-ps, sqm, sqn), \end{aligned}$$

and so we have $u_2=\frac{sqm}{d}$, where $d:=\gcd(rqm, rqm+sqm-ps, sqm, sqn)$. Since

$$d=\gcd(rqm, ps, sqm, sqn)=\gcd(qm, s),$$

we obtain that $d|s$. Consequently we can write $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=\gamma_2 R_0^{sqm/d}=\gamma_2(R_0^{s/d})^{qm}$. We conclude the proof setting $R:=\gamma R_0^{s/d}$, where we choose $\gamma\in K^\times$ such that $\gamma^{qm}=\gamma_2$. □

Proposition 7.3. *Let $m,n\in\mathbb{N}$ be coprime with $m,n>1$ and let $P,Q\in L^{(l)}$ with*

$$[P,Q]\in K^\times \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{v_{1,1}(P)}{v_{1,1}(Q)}=\frac{v_{0,1}(P)}{v_{0,1}(Q)}=\frac{m}{n}.$$

Take $T_0\in K[P,Q]$ and set $T_j:=[T_{j-1},P]$ for $j\geq 1$. Assume that $(\rho_0,\sigma_0)\in\mathfrak{V}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies

1. *$v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)>0$,*
2. *$\operatorname{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(T_j)\sim\operatorname{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)$ for all j with $T_j\neq 0$,*
3. *$\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)=\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q)\in\frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{N}$,*
4. *$b<a/l$, where $(a/l,b):=\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)$.*

Let $I_1:=[(0,-1),(\rho_0,\sigma_0)]$ and

$$(\tilde\rho,\tilde\sigma):=\min\{(\rho,\sigma)\in\operatorname{Dir}(P)\cap I_1 : v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)>0 \text{ for all } (\rho_0,\sigma_0)\geq(\rho',\sigma')\geq(\rho,\sigma)\}.$$

Then for all $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}$ with $(\tilde\rho,\tilde\sigma)\leq(\rho,\sigma)<(\rho_0,\sigma_0)$ and all $j\geq 0$ we have

$$[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(T_j),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]=0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{v_{\rho,\sigma}(T_j)}{v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)}=\frac{v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(T_j)}{v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)}.$$

Proof. Mimic the proof of Proposition 7.1. □

Corollary 7.4. *Let $m,n\in\mathbb{N}$ be coprime with $m,n>1$ and let $P,Q\in L^{(l)}$ with*

$$[P,Q]\in K^\times \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{v_{1,1}(P)}{v_{1,1}(Q)}=\frac{v_{0,1}(P)}{v_{0,1}(Q)}=\frac{m}{n}.$$

Assume that $(\rho_0,\sigma_0)\in\mathfrak{V}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies

1. *$v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)>0$,*
2. *$\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)=\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q)\in\frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{N}$,*
3. *$b<a/l$, where $(a/l,b):=\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)$.*

Let $(\tilde\rho,\tilde\sigma)$ be as in Proposition 7.3 and let $F\in L^{(l)}$ be the (ρ_0,σ_0)-homogeneous element obtained in Theorem 2.6. If there exist $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$ coprime, such that $\operatorname{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(F)=\frac{p}{q}(a/l,b)$, then for all $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}$ with $(\tilde\rho,\tilde\sigma)\leq(\rho,\sigma)<(\rho_0,\sigma_0)$ there exists a (ρ,σ)-homogeneous element $R\in L^{(l)}$ such that $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)=R^{qm}$.

Proof. Mimic the proof of Corollary 7.2. □

Remark 7.5. Let $P\in L^{(l)}\setminus\{0\}$ and let (ρ',σ') and (ρ'',σ'') be consecutive elements in $\operatorname{Dir}(P)$. If $v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P),v_{\rho'',\sigma''}(P)>0$, then $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)>0$ for all $(\rho',\sigma')<(\rho,\sigma)<(\rho'',\sigma'')$ [28].

In the following theorem and in Proposition 7.8 we consider the order in $I =](1,-1),(1,0)]$.

Theorem 7.6. *Let $(A_0,(\rho_0,\sigma_0)),(A_1,(\rho_1,\sigma_1)),\dots,(A_k,(\rho_k,\sigma_k))$ be the regular corners of an (m,n)-pair (P,Q) in $L^{(l)}$, where $(\rho_i,\sigma_i)<(\rho_{i+1},\sigma_{i+1})$ for all $i<k$. The following facts hold:*

(1) *$A(P)=\{(\rho_1,\sigma_1),\dots,(\rho_k,\sigma_k)\}$. In particular, if (P,Q) is a standard (m,n)-pair, then $(A_0,A_0',(\rho_0,\sigma_0))$ is the starting triple of (P,Q), where $A_0':=\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)$.*

(2) *For all $j\geq 1$ there exists $d_j\in\mathbb{N}$ maximum such that $\ell_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(P)=R_j^{md_j}$ for some (ρ_j,σ_j)-homogeneous $R_j\in L^{(l)}$. If A_0 is of type II, then this holds also for $j=0$.*

(3) *For all $j>0$ the element F_j constructed via Theorem 2.6 satisfies*

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(F_j)=\frac{p_j}{q_j}\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(P),$$

where p_j and q_j are coprime. If A_0 is of type II, then this holds also for $j=0$.

(4) *$q_i\nmid d_i$ for all $i>0$.*

(5) *$q_j\mid d_i$ for all $i>j>0$.*

(6) *$q_i\nmid q_j$ for all $i>j>0$.*

Set $D_j:=\gcd(a_j,b_j,a_{j-1},b_{j-1})$, where $A_j=(a_j/l,b_j)$ and $A_{j-1}=(a_{j-1}/l,b_{j-1})$. Then

(7) *$d_j\mid D_j$ and $\Omega(D_j)\geq\Omega(d_j)\geq j-1$ for all $j>0$, where for $n\in\mathbb{N}$ we let $\Omega(n)$ denote the number of prime factors of n, counted with multiplicity.*

(8) *If A_0 is of type II, then $q_0\nmid d_0$ and for all $i>0$, we have*

$$q_0\mid d_i,\quad q_i\nmid q_0,\quad \text{and}\quad \Omega(d_i)\geq i.$$

Proof. By Remark 5.10 and Propositions 5.2 and 5.22 statement (1) is true. By Corollary 5.7(1) we know that $v_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(P)>0$ for all j. If A_0 is of type II, then $[\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P),\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(Q)]=0$. In the general case, when $j\geq 1$, by Remark 5.10, we are in Case II.a), and so $[\ell_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(P),\ell_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(Q)]=0$. Hence, by Proposition 2.1(2b), statement (2) holds. Statement (3) follows from Remark 5.10 and Proposition 5.14(1).

In order to prove statement (4), assume by contradiction that $q_j\mid d_j$. Then $\widetilde{R}:=R_j^{p_jd_j/q_j}$ satisfies

$$[\widetilde{R},\ell_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(P)]=0\quad\text{and}\quad v_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(\widetilde{R})=v_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(F_j)=\rho_j+\sigma_j,\tag{7.20}$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(F_j)=\frac{p_j}{q_j}\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(P)=\operatorname{en}_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(\widetilde{R}).$$

But the existence of $\widetilde{R}$ satisfying (7.20) contradicts Proposition 2.10(5) (The condition $s>0$ or $\#\operatorname{factors}(p)>1$ required in Proposition 2.10(5) is satisfied if and only if $\#\operatorname{factors}(\mathfrak{p}(z))>1$, which holds because we are in case II).

By Corollary 5.7(1) we have $v_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(P)>0$ for all $j\geq 0$, and hence, by Remark 7.5, we have $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P)>0$ if (ρ,σ) lies between (ρ_0,σ_0) and (ρ_k,σ_k). Let $(\tilde\rho,\tilde\sigma)$ be as in Proposition 7.1. By its very definition $(\tilde\rho,\tilde\sigma)\geq(\rho_i,\sigma_i)>(\rho_j,\sigma_j)$. Thus the hypothesis of Corollary 7.2 are satisfied with $(\rho_0,\sigma_0)=(\rho_j,\sigma_j)$ and $(\rho,\sigma)=(\rho_i,\sigma_i)$, and hence we have

$$R_i^{md_i}=\ell_{\rho_i\sigma_i}(P)=R^{mq_j}\quad\text{for some } R\in L^{(l)},$$

which gives statement (5) by the maximality of d_i.

Statement (6) follows from (4) and (5). In order to prove statement (7), note that $d_j|D_j$ since

$$A_j=d_j\operatorname{en}_{\rho_j\sigma_j}(R_j)\quad\text{and}\quad A_{j-1}=d_j\operatorname{st}_{\rho_j\sigma_j}(R_j),$$

and a straightforward computation using (4), (5) and (6) proves the last assertion of (7). The proof of statement (8) follows along the lines of the proofs of (4), (5), (6) and (7). □

Remark 7.7. Let $f, \overline{f} \in K[x]$ be polynomials. If $f(x) = \overline{f}(x^n)$, then λ is a root of f if and only if λ^n is a root of $\overline{f}$. Moreover, the multiplicity m_λ of λ in f is the same as the multiplicity $\overline{m}_{\lambda^n}$ of λ^n in $\overline{f}$ and consequently, if f is a dth power, then $\overline{f}$ is also a dth power.

Proposition 7.8. *With the notations of Theorem 7.6, we have:*

(1) *If* $\Omega(d_{j_0}) = j_0 - 1$ *for some* $j_0 > 0$, *then* $l - \frac{a_0}{b_0} > 1$.

(2) *Assume that* $(A_0, (\rho_0, \sigma_0))$ *is of type II.b) and that* $\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)$ *is at most an* m*th power in* $L^{(l')}$, *where* $l' := \operatorname{lcm}(\rho_0, l)$. *Write* $A^{(1)} = (a/l', b)$, *where* $A^{(1)}$ *is constructed via Propositions 5.16 and 5.18. Then*

$$l' - \frac{a}{b} > 1.$$

(3) *Let* (P, Q) *be a standard* (m, n)*-pair. Assume that* $A_0 = (1, 0) + r(1, \rho_0)$ *for some* $r \geq 1$, $\sigma_0 = -1$ *and* $A_0' = (1, 0)$. *If* $\gcd(r, \rho_0) = 1$ *or* ρ_0 *is a prime number, then* $\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)$ *is at most an* m*th power in* $L^{(\rho_0)}$. *Moreover, in both cases* $\gamma(\rho_0 - 2) > \rho_0$, *where* $\gamma = \frac{m_\lambda}{m}$ *is as before Proposition 6.4.*

(4) *If* (P, Q) *is an standard* (m, n)*-pair, then* $\gcd(a_0, b_0) \neq 2$ *and* $q_0 \neq 2$.

Proof. (1) Note that $(A_0, (\rho_0, \sigma_0))$ cannot be of type II by Theorem 7.6(8). If $(A_0, (\rho_0, \sigma_0))$ is of type I, then Proposition 5.13 yields $l - \frac{a_0}{b_0} > 1$. If $(A_0, (\rho_0, \sigma_0))$ is of type III, then we take φ as in Proposition 5.17. By statement (3) of that proposition, we know that $((a_0/l, b_0), (\rho', \sigma'))$ is a regular corner of $(\varphi(P), \varphi(Q))$, where $(\rho', \sigma') := \operatorname{Pred}_{\varphi(P)}(\rho_0, \sigma_0)$, while by statement (1), we have

$$\ell_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(P) = \ell_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(\varphi(P)) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(Q) = \ell_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(\varphi(Q)), \quad \text{for } j > 0. \tag{7.21}$$

Hence $(A_0, (\rho', \sigma')), (A_1, (\rho_1, \sigma_1)), \ldots, (A_k, (\rho_k, \sigma_k))$ are regular corners of $(\varphi(P), \varphi(Q))$. We claim that there are no other. In fact, given a new regular corner $(A'', (\rho'', \sigma''))$, it is impossible that $(\rho'', \sigma'') > (\rho', \sigma')$, since otherwise $(1, 0) \geq (\rho'', \sigma'') > (\rho_0, \sigma_0)$, by Proposition 5.17[29] and $(\rho'', \sigma'') \in A(\varphi(P))$, by Theorem 7.6(1), which contradicts the fact that, by (7.21), Remark 5.9 and Proposition 3.7, we have

$$A(P) \cap \,](\rho_0, \sigma_0), (1, 0)] = A(\varphi(P)) \cap \,](\rho_0, \sigma_0), (1, 0)].$$

On the other hand, if $(\rho'', \sigma'') < (\rho', \sigma')$, then there exists $r \geq 1$, such that the regular corners of $(\varphi(P), \varphi(Q))$ form a set

$$\{(\tilde{A}_0, (\tilde{\rho}_0, \tilde{\sigma}_0)), \ldots, (\tilde{A}_{k+r}, (\tilde{\rho}_{k+r}, \tilde{\sigma}_{k+r}))\},$$

where the first r corners are new,

$$(\tilde{A}_r, (\tilde{\rho}_r, \tilde{\sigma}_r)) = (A_0, (\rho', \sigma')) \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{A}_{j+r}, (\tilde{\rho}_{j+r}, \tilde{\sigma}_{j+r})) = (A_j, (\rho_j, \sigma_j)) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, k.$$

For each $0 < j \leq k + r$, let $\tilde{d}_j$ be as d_j, but for the (m, n)-pair $(\varphi(P), \varphi(Q))$. But then, by (7.21), we have $d_j = \tilde{d}_{j+r}$ for all j, and the fact that $\tilde{d}_{j_0+r} = j_0 - 1$ contradicts Theorem 7.6(7). This proves the claim.

Once again, $(A_0, (\rho', \sigma'))$ cannot be of type II by Theorem 7.6(8), and if $(A_0, (\rho', \sigma'))$ is of type I, then Proposition 5.13 yields $l - \frac{a_0}{b_0} > 1$. If it is of type III, then we repeat the same proceeding as above. The same argument as in the proof of Proposition 5.19 shows that case III can occur only finitely many times, finishing the proof of (1).

(2) Using Proposition 5.18 it is easy to check that $(A_0,(\rho_0,\sigma_0))$ and $(A^{(1)},(\rho',\sigma'))$ are regular corners of the (m,n)-pair $(\varphi(P),\varphi(Q))$, where $(\rho',\sigma') := \mathrm{Pred}_{\varphi(P)}(\rho_0,\sigma_0)$. But then there exists $r\geq 1$ such that the regular corners of $(\varphi(P),\varphi(Q))$ are

$$(\tilde{A}_0,(\tilde{\rho}_0,\tilde{\sigma}_0)),\dots,(\tilde{A}_{k+r},(\tilde{\rho}_{k+r},\tilde{\sigma}_{k+r})),$$

where for $j\geq 0$ we have $\tilde{A}_{j+r}=A_j$. Let $\tilde{d}_r$ be maximum such that $\ell_{\tilde{\rho}_r,\tilde{\sigma}_r}(\varphi(P)) = R^{m\tilde{d}_r}$ for some $R\in L^{(l')}$. Since $\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(\varphi(P))$ is at most an mth power in $L^{(l')}$ and $(\rho_0,\sigma_0)=(\tilde{\rho}_r,\tilde{\sigma}_r)$, we obtain $\tilde{d}_r=1$. Hence, by Theorem 7.6(7), we have $r=1$, and so $(\tilde{A}_0,(\tilde{\rho}_0,\tilde{\sigma}_0))=(A^{(1)},(\rho',\sigma'))$. By statement (1) we have $l'-a/b>1$, as desired.

(3) By Corollary 5.7(1) and Remark 3.1, we have $\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)=\mu R^m$ for some $\mu\in K^\times$ and $R\in L^{(1)}$. Furthermore, since

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(R)=A_0'=(1,0),\quad \mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(R)=A_0=(1,0)+r(1,\rho_0),\quad \sigma_0=-1\quad\text{and}\quad R\in L^{(1)},$$

it follows from Remark 2.8, that there exist $f,\overline{f}\in K[x]$ with $f(0)\neq 0$ and $\deg(f)=r\rho_0$, such that

$$R = xf(z) = x\overline{f}(z^{\rho_0}),$$

where $z:=x^{1/\rho_0}y$. We must prove that if $R=R_1^d$, for some $R_1\in L^{(\rho_0)}$, then $d=1$. But, under this assumption, $\mathrm{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(R_1)=(1/d,0)$, hence $d\mid\rho_0$. Using Remark 7.7 we obtain $d\mid r$, and so, if $\gcd(r,\rho_0)=1$, then $d=1$, as desired. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(R)=(1,0)$, if $R=\mu_1R_1^{\rho_0}$, then

$$v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(R_1^{\rho_0+\sigma_0}) = \frac{\rho_0+\sigma_0}{\rho_0}v_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(R)=\rho_0+\sigma_0\qquad\text{and}\qquad [R_1^{\rho_0+\sigma_0},\ell_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)]=0,$$

which contradicts Proposition 2.10(5). Consequently $d\neq\rho_0$, and so, for ρ_0 prime we have $d=1$. Hence, if $\gcd(r,\rho_0)=1$ or ρ_0 is prime, then statement (2) applies[30] and yields $l'-a/b>1$, where $l'=\rho_0$. By Propositions 5.16 and 5.18(3)

$$\Big(\frac{a}{l'},b\Big)=A^{(1)}=(1,0)+\gamma(1/\rho_0,1)=\Big(\frac{\rho_0+\gamma}{\rho_0},\gamma\Big),$$

from which we deduce $\rho_0-\frac{\rho_0+\gamma}{\gamma}=l'-\frac{a}{b}>1$ and then $\gamma(\rho_0-2)>\rho_0$, as desired.

(4) Note that $(\rho,\sigma)=(\rho_0,\sigma_0)$, $A_0'=(r',s')$ and $F=F_0$ are as before Proposition 6.4. By Proposition 6.1(1) we know that $(1,-1)<(\rho,\sigma)<(1,0)$, and by Proposition 6.4(1) we have

$$v_{1,-1}(A_0') = r'-s'>0=v_{1,-1}(2,2), \tag{7.22}$$

which implies $A_0'\neq(2,2)$. Assume by contradiction that $q_0=2$ or $\gcd(a_0,b_0)=2$[31]. Let μ be as in Proposition 6.4(4). Since $0<\mu<1$ and $\mu=p_0/q_0$, this assumption implies $\mu=1/2$. We have

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0')=v_{\rho,\sigma}(A_0)=2v_{\rho,\sigma}(F)=2v_{\rho,\sigma}(1,1)=v_{\rho,\sigma}(2,2).$$

Then, by Remark 3.2

$$\mathrm{dir}(A_0'-(2,2))=(\rho,\sigma)<(1,0).$$

From this, the second inequality in (7.22) and Lemma 3.4, it follows that

$$0\leq s'<r'=v_{1,0}(A_0')<v_{1,0}(2,2)=2.$$

Hence necessarily $A_0'=(1,0)$. Therefore $(\rho,\sigma)=(2,-1)$, and we are in the situation of statement (3) with $\rho_0=\rho=2$. The contradiction $0=\gamma(\rho_0-2)>\rho_0$ concludes the proof. □

Corollary 7.9. *Let (P,Q) be a standard (m,n)-pair in L. Write $(a,b):=\frac{1}{m}\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$. Then $(a,b)\in\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}$ and $\gcd(a,b)>2$. Furthermore $B\neq p$ and $B\neq 2p$ for any prime p, where B is as at the beginning of Section 4.*

Proof. By Remark 5.12 we know that (a,b) is the first component of a regular corner of (P,Q). Hence, by Remark 5.8 we have $(a,b) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ and by Proposition 5.19 we know $\gcd(a,b) > 1$. Next we discard $\gcd(a,b) = 2$. Let k be the number of regular corners in $A(P)$. If $k = 0$, then $\gcd(a,b) = 2$ contradicts Proposition 7.8(4). Assume $k > 0$. Let q_0 and D_k be as in Theorem 7.6. By statements (7) and (8) of Theorem 7.6 we have $q_0 | D_k$, while $\gcd(a,b) = 2$ implies $D_k \mid 2$. But $q_0 = 1$ contradicts Proposition 6.4(4) and $q_0 = 2$ contradicts Proposition 7.8(4). Consequently $\gcd(a,b) > 2$.

Now assume that (P,Q) is as in Corollary 5.21. In particular,

$$B = \gcd(v_{1,1}(P), v_{1,1}(Q)) = \frac{1}{m} v_{1,1}(P) \quad \text{and} \quad (a,b) = \frac{1}{m} \operatorname{en}_{1,0}(P) = \frac{1}{m} \operatorname{st}_{1,1}(P),$$

and so $a + b = B$, which implies $\gcd(a,b) \mid B$. Now, if $B = p$ or $B = 2p$ for some prime p, then $\gcd(a,b) \in \{1, 2, p, 2p\}$. Since $\gcd(a,b) > 2$ and $\gcd(a,b) = 2p$ is impossible, we have to discard only the case $\gcd(a,b) = p$. But in that case $a = b = p$, which contradicts $a < b$ and finishes the proof. □

In the following proposition we give a condition under which the Newton polygon of P has no vertical edge at the right hand side.

Corollary 7.10. *Let (P,Q) be an standard (m,n)-pair and let (ρ,σ), A_0 and F be as in the discussion above Proposition 6.4. By Proposition 6.4(4) there exist $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ coprime, such that $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = \frac{p}{q} A_0$. Assume that $A_0 = \frac{1}{m} \operatorname{st}_{1,0}(P)$. If $A_0 = (q,b)$, then $\operatorname{st}_{1,0}(P) = \operatorname{en}_{1,0}(P)$.*

Proof. Along the proof we use the notations of Theorem 7.6. Assume that $\operatorname{st}_{1,0}(P) \neq \operatorname{en}_{1,0}(P)$. Note that $(\rho_0, \sigma_0) = (\rho, \sigma)$, $q_0 = q$, $k = 1$ and $(A_1, (\rho_1, \sigma_1)) = \big(\frac{1}{m} \operatorname{en}_{1,0}(P), (1,0)\big)$. By Theorem 7.6(3),

$$\operatorname{en}_{1,0}(F_1) = \frac{p_1}{q_1} \frac{1}{m} \operatorname{en}_{1,0}(P),$$

and so $1 = v_{1,0}(F_1) = p_1 v_{1,0}(A_0)/q_1 = p_1 q / q_1$. Consequently, $q_1 = q = q_0$, which contradicts Theorem 7.6(6) and concludes the proof. □

In the following theorem we do not assume that K is algebraically closed.

Theorem 7.11. *Let (P,Q) be an standard (m,n)-pair and let (ρ,σ), A_0, F and γ be as before Proposition 6.4. We have either $v_{1,1}(A_0) > 20$, or $A_0 = (4,12)$, $(\rho,\sigma) = (4,-1)$, $\gamma = 3$ and $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (3,9)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that K is algebraically closed. Let A_0' and $A^{(1)}$ be as above Proposition 6.4. We will analyze all possible pairs $A_0 = (u,v)$ with $u + v \leq 20$, satisfying all the conditions of Propositions 6.4, 6.5, 6.7 and Proposition 7.8(4). In Table 2 we list all possible pairs (u,v) with $3 < u < v \leq u(u-1)$, $\gcd(u,v) > 2$ and $16 \leq u + v \leq 20$. We also list all the possible $(f_1, f_2) = \mu(u,v)$ with $f_1 \geq 2$ and $0 < \mu < 1$. Then we compute the corresponding (ρ,σ) using Proposition 6.4(6) and we verify if there can be an $A_0' = (r',s')$ with $s' < r' < u$ and $v_{\rho,\sigma}(u,v) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(r',s')$. This happens in four cases. By Proposition 6.9 the case with $(\rho,\sigma) = (2,-1)$ is impossible. By Proposition 6.4(9), we know that in the remaining three cases $\gamma \leq \frac{v - s'}{\rho}$. Moreover, in two of these cases $d := \gcd(f_1 - 1, f_2 - 1) = 1$, and so $\gamma = \frac{v - s'}{\rho}$. By statements (2) and (4) of Proposition 5.18 we know that $A^{(1)} \in L^{(l')}$ is the first entry of a regular corner of an (m,n) pair in $L^{(l')}$, where $l' = \operatorname{lcm}(l, \rho)$. In the cases we are considering $l = 1$ and so $l' = \rho$. We write $A^{(1)} = (a/l', b)$. In the case $A_0 = (4,12)$, $(\rho,\sigma) = (4,-1)$ and $A_0' = (1,0)$ we are in the framework of Proposition 7.8(3) with $r = 3$ and $(\rho_0, \sigma_0) = (\rho, \sigma)$. Since $\gcd(\rho_0, r) = \gcd(4,3) = 1$, we have $\gamma(\rho_0 - 2) > \rho_0$, which implies $\gamma \geq 3$. Hence, in this case $\gamma = 3$. In Table 3 we list the three cases with the γ's, the corresponding $A^{(1)}$, d and $l' - a/b$. In the

A_0	(f_1, f_2)	(ρ, σ)	A_0'
(4,12)	(2,6)	(5,-1)	×
(4,12)	(3,9)	(4,-1)	(1,0)
(5,15)	(2,6)	(5,-1)	(2,0)
(5,15)	(3,9)	(4,-1)	×
(5,15)	(4,12)	(11,-3)	×
(6,12)	(2,4)	(3,-1)	(2,0)

A_0	(f_1, f_2)	(ρ, σ)	A_0'
(6,12)	(3,6)	(5,-2)	×
(6,12)	(4,8)	(7,-3)	×
(6,12)	(5,10)	(9,-4)	×
(8,12)	(2,3)	(2,-1)	(2,0) or (3,2)
(8,12)	(4,6)	(5,-3)	×
(8,12)	(6,9)	(8,-5)	×

TABLE 2

A_0	(f_1, f_2)	(ρ, σ)	A_0'	d	γ	$A^{(1)}$	$l' - \frac{a}{b}$
(4,12)	(3,9)	(4,-1)	(1,0)	2	3	$\left(\frac{7}{4}, 3\right)$	$1 + \frac{2}{3}$
(5,15)	(2,6)	(5,-1)	(2,0)	1	3	$\left(\frac{13}{5}, 3\right)$	$1 - \frac{1}{3}$
(6,12)	(2,4)	(3,-1)	(2,0)	1	4	$\left(\frac{10}{3}, 4\right)$	$1 - \frac{1}{2}$

TABLE 3

first case, where $A_0 = (4, 12)$, $(\rho, \sigma) = (4, -1)$, $\gamma = 3$ and $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (3, 9)$, by Proposition 5.19, we may have a regular corner of type I at $A^{(1)}$. In order to finish the proof, we have to discard the remaining cases.

By Proposition 5.19 the second case is impossible, since $\gcd(13, 3) = 1$ and $1 - 1/3 < 1$.

Again by Proposition 5.19, in the third case there could be a regular corner of type II with

$$A^{(1)} = \left(\frac{a}{l'}, b\right) = \left(\frac{10}{3}, 4\right). \tag{7.23}$$

Note that, with the notation of Proposition 5.14, we have

$$d := \gcd(a, b) = 2, \quad \overline{a} := \frac{a}{d} = 5, \quad \overline{b} := \frac{b}{d} = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \left\lfloor l'(bl' - a) + \frac{1}{\overline{b}} \right\rfloor = 6.$$

According to Proposition 5.14(4) the only possible μ's are 1, 3 or 5. Let

$$(\rho_1, \sigma_1) := \mathrm{dir}(\mu\overline{a} - \rho, \mu\overline{b}\rho - \rho) = \mathrm{dir}(\mu 5 - 3, \mu 3) = \begin{cases} (3, -2) & \text{if } \mu = 1, \\ (5, -4) & \text{if } \mu = 3, \\ (27, -22) & \text{if } \mu = 5. \end{cases}$$

For $\mu = 3$ we obtain $\frac{\rho_1}{\gcd(\rho_1, l')} = 5 > 4 = b$ and for $\mu = 5$ we obtain $\frac{\rho_1}{\gcd(\rho_1, l')} = 9 > 4 = b$, which contradict Proposition 5.14(2). Hence we are left with $\mu = 1$ and $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = (3, -2)$. Since $\mathrm{lcm}(l', \rho_1) = \mathrm{lcm}(3, 3) = 3 = l'$, applying Propositions 5.16 and 5.18 we can assume that $\left(\left(\frac{10}{3}, 4\right), (3, -2)\right)$ is a regular corner of (P, Q) of type II.a) in $L^{(l')}$. But then, by Remark 5.11 we must have a regular corner at $\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{3,-2}(P)$. By Definition 5.5(1) the only possible choice for $\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{3,-2}(P)$ is $(8/3, 3)$, which is discarded by Proposition 5.19, concluding the proof. □

Corollary 7.12. *Let $L = K[x, y]$ be the polynomial algebra over a non necessarily algebraically closed characteristic zero field K. We have $B = 16$ or $B > 20$.*

Proof. Assume that $B \leq 20$. By Corollary 5.21 there exists a standard (m,n)-pair (P,Q) which is also a minimal pair, such that $\gcd(v_{1,1}(P), v_{1,1}(Q)) \leq 20$. Let (ρ,σ), $A_0 = (a,b)$ and F be as above of Proposition 6.4. Since

$$v_{1,1}(A_0) = \frac{1}{m} v_{1,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \leq \frac{1}{m} v_{1,1}(P) = B \leq 20, \tag{7.24}$$

by Theorem 7.11 we have

$$(\rho,\sigma) = (4,-1), \quad A_0 = (4,12) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{4,-1}(F) = (3,9) = \frac{3}{4}(4,12) = \frac{3}{4}A_0,$$

and consequently $q_0 = 4$, according to Theorem 7.6(3). If A_0 is the only regular corner, then $B = v_{1,1}(A_0) = 16$. Otherwise assume by contradiction that there exists $(A_1, (\rho_1,\sigma_1))$ as in Theorem 7.6 and write $A_1 = (a_1, b_1)$. Then

- $4 | \gcd(a_1, b_1)$, by Theorem 7.6(8),
- $a_1 \geq a = 4$, since $(-1,0) < (\rho_1,\sigma_1) \leq (1,0)$ (see Remark 1.8)[32],
- $a_1 + b_1 \leq 20$ (similar to (7.24)),
- $b_1 \geq 4(a_1 - 1)$ since $v_{4,-1}(m(a_1,b_1)) \leq v_{4,-1}(P) = v_{4,-1}(m(4,12))$.

This leaves us with the only possibility that $(a_1,b_1) = (4,16)$, hence $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) = (1,0)$. But this contradicts Corollary 7.10 and concludes the proof. □

Corollary 7.13. *If $B = 16$, then there exist a standard (m,n)-pair (P,Q) that is a minimal pair, and $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in K^\times$ such that*

$$\mathrm{Dir}(P) = \mathrm{Dir}(Q) = \{(4,-1), (-2,1), (-1,0), (0,-1)\}, \tag{7.25}$$

the $(4,-1)$-homogeneous element $R_0 := x(xy^4 - \lambda_0)^3$ satisfies

$$\ell_{4,-1}(P) = \lambda_P R_0^m \quad \textit{and} \quad \ell_{4,-1}(Q) = \lambda_Q R_0^n, \tag{7.26}$$

and the $(-2,1)$-homogeneous element $R_1 := y(xy^2 - \lambda_1)$ satisfies

$$\ell_{-2,1}(P) = \lambda_P R_1^{4m} \quad \textit{and} \quad \ell_{-2,1}(Q) = \lambda_Q R_1^{4n}. \tag{7.27}$$

Moreover, the $(4,-1)$-homogeneous element F of Theorem 2.6 satisfies $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (3,9)$.

Proof. By Corollary 5.21, there exists a standard (m,n)-pair (P,Q) that is a minimal pair, such that $\gcd(v_{1,1}(P), v_{1,1}(Q)) = 16$, and

$$(-1,1) < \mathrm{Succ}_P(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_Q(1,0) < (-1,0). \tag{7.28}$$

Let (ρ,σ), A_0, λ, m_λ and γ be as above of Proposition 6.4. By Theorem 7.11 we know that

$$(\rho,\sigma) = (4,-1), \quad A_0 = (4,12), \quad \gamma = 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F) = (3,9) = \frac{3}{4}A_0. \tag{7.29}$$

By statements (2), (3) and (4) of Proposition 6.1 and Remark 3.1, there exist $\lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in K^\times$ and a $(4,-1)$-homogeneous polynomial R such that

$$\ell_{4,-1}(P) = \lambda_P R^m \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{4,-1}(Q) = \lambda_Q R^n. \tag{7.30}$$

Moreover, since $\mathrm{en}_{4,-1}(R) = A_0 = (4,12)$ and R is $(4,-1)$-homogeneous

$$\mathrm{Supp}(R) \subseteq \{(4,12), (3,8), (2,4), (1,0)\}.$$

Thus, $R = x\mathfrak{r}(z) = x\overline{\mathfrak{r}}(z^4)$ for some $r, \mathfrak{r} \in K[x]$, where $z := x^{1/4}y$ and $\deg(\overline{\mathfrak{r}}) = 3$. Now, since $m_\lambda = 3m$, the multiplicity of the factor $z - \lambda$ in $\mathfrak{r}(z)$ is 3, and then, by Remark 7.7 the multiplicity of the factor $z^4 - \lambda^4$ in $\overline{\mathfrak{r}}(z^4)$ is 3. Hence there exists $\mu \in K^\times$, such that

$$R = \mu x(z^4 - \lambda^4)^3 = \mu x(xy^4 - \lambda^4)^3.$$

Then we obtain (7.26) with $\lambda_0 := \lambda^4$, λ_P replaced by $\lambda_P \mu^m$ and λ_Q replaced by $\lambda_Q \mu^n$.

$$R = \mu x(z^4 - \lambda^4)^3 = \mu x(xy^4 - \lambda^4)^3 = \mu x(xy^4 - \lambda_0)^3 \qquad \text{where } \lambda_0 := \lambda^4.$$

Combining this with (7.30), and replacing $\lambda_P\mu^m$ by λ_P and $\lambda_Q\mu^n$ by λ_Q, we obtain (7.26).

Note that there are no directions in $\mathrm{Dir}(P) \cup \mathrm{Dir}(Q)$ in $]{(4,-1),(1,0)}] \subset]{(4,-1),(1,1)}[$, since

$$v_{1,1}(\mathrm{en}_{4,-1}(P)) = v_{1,1}(mA_0) = 16m = v_{1,1}(P) \quad \text{and} \quad v_{1,1}(\mathrm{en}_{4,-1}(Q)) = v_{1,1}(Q)^{[33]}.$$

Hence, by (7.28),

$$(-1,1) < \mathrm{Succ}_P(4,-1), \mathrm{Succ}_Q(4,-1) < (-1,0).$$

Let $(\rho',\sigma') := \min\{\mathrm{Succ}_P(4,-1), \mathrm{Succ}_Q(4,-1)\}$. We claim that $(-3,1) \le (\rho',\sigma') < (-1,0)$ is impossible. Otherwise

$$v_{-3,1}(P) = v_{-3,1}(\mathrm{st}_{-3,1}(P)) = v_{-3,1}(\mathrm{en}_{4,-1}(P)) = v_{-3,1}(mA_0) = 0,$$

from which we obtain $\max\{0, \deg_y(P(0,y))\} = 0$, contradicting [14, Theorem 10.2.6]. Therefore $(-1,1) < (\rho',\sigma') < (-3,1)$, and it is also clear that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0$ for $(4,-1) < (\rho,\sigma) \le (\rho',\sigma')$.[34] Then, by Corollary 7.2[35] and (7.29), there exist a (ρ',σ')-homogeneous polynomial $\overline{R}$ such that $\ell_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = \overline{R}^{4m}$. Since $\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = m(4,12)$, we know that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(\overline{R}) = (1,3)$. By Remark 1.8,

$$v_{1,0}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(\overline{R})) < v_{1,0}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(\overline{R})) = 1.$$

So $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(\overline{R}) = (0,k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. But $k = 0$ is impossible since it implies $(\rho',\sigma') = (-3,1)$. Moreover

$$2 = v_{-1,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(\overline{R})) > v_{-1,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(\overline{R})) = k,$$

and therefore $k = 1$, which implies $(\rho',\sigma') = (-2,1)$. Consequently $\overline{R} = \mu y(xy^2 - \lambda_1)$ for some $\mu, \lambda_1 \in K^\times$. Hence, $\ell_{-2,1}(P) = \mu^m R_1^m$. But since $\mathrm{en}_{4,-1}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{-2,1}(P)$, necessarily $\mu^m = \lambda_P$. This shows that the first equality in (7.27) is true. The same argument shows that the second one is also true. It remains to achieve (7.25). But $\mathrm{st}_{4,-1}(P) = m\,\mathrm{st}_{4,-1}(R_0) = (m,0)$ and $\mathrm{en}_{-2,1}(P) = 4m\,\mathrm{en}_{-2,1}(R_1) = (0,4m)$. Adding eventually a constant, we can assume that $P(0,0) \neq 0$ and then an elementary geometric argument shows that (7.25) holds for P. Similarly it also holds for Q. □

Remark 7.14. As long as we are not able to discard the possibility $B = 16$, there can be expected no real progress in proving or disproving the JC just by describing the admissible A_0's. However we submit without proof a complete list of small values. Let

$$B_0 := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{1,0}(P) \qquad \text{and} \qquad B_1 := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P).$$

If $B \le 50$, then necessarily

a) A_0 belongs to the following set:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{X} := \{&(4,12),(5,20),(6,15),(6,30),(7,21),(7,35),(7,42),(8,24),(8,28),(9,21),\\ &(9,24),(9,36),(10,25),(10,30),(10,40),(11,33),(12,28),(12,30),(12,33),\\ &(12,36),(14,35),(15,35),(18,30)\}.\end{aligned}$$

b) $B_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ or $B_0 = (8,40)$ and $A_0 = (4,12)$.

c) $B_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ or $B_1 \in \{(8,32),(8,40),(6,18),(6,24),(6,36),(6,42),(9,27)\}$. Furthermore,
- if $B_1 = (8,32)$, then $B_0 = (8,28)$,
- if $B_1 = (8,40)$ then $B_0 = B_1$ or $B_0 = (8,28)$,
- if $B_1 = (6,18+6k)$, then $B_0 = (6,15)$,
- if $B_1 = (9,27)$, then $B_0 = (9,21)$ or $B_0 = (9,24)$.

The cases listed in a) and b) coincide with the list for B_0 given in [7, Theorem 2.24(1)], where $B_0 = (E_1, D_1)$ is written as (D_1, E_1) and $B_1 = (E, D)$ is written as (D, E). However, our list in c), in addition to the cases considered in [7], contains the pairs $\{(6,18),(6,24),(6,36),(6,42),(9,27)\}$. His result follows from a computer search and some computations on a parameter α, which should be the same as our q. Our list was found using the same techniques as in Theorem 7.11 and Corollary 7.12.

8 The case $B = 16$

In this section we will analyze the case $B = 16$. We apply the flip automorphism ψ_1 of L, given by $\psi_1(x) := y$ and $\psi_1(y) := -x$, to the standard (m,n)-pair (P,Q) obtained in Corollary 7.13, and we obtain a minimal pair $(P_0, Q_0) \in L$ with

$$\mathrm{Dir}(P_0) = \mathrm{Dir}(Q_0) = \{(-1,4),(1,-2),(0,-1),(-1,0)\}.$$

Moreover, by the same corollary there exist $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in K^\times$ such that $R_0 := y(x^4y - \lambda_0)^3$ satisfies

$$\ell_{-1,4}(P_0) = \lambda_P R_0^m \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{-1,4}(Q_0) = \lambda_Q R_0^n,$$

and $R_1 := x(x^2y - \lambda_1)$ satisfies

$$\ell_{1,-2}(P_0) = \lambda_P R_1^{4m} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{1,-2}(Q_0) = \lambda_Q R_1^{4n},$$

where $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ are coprime with

$$\frac{v_{1,1}(P_0)}{v_{1,1}(Q_0)} = \frac{v_{0,1}(P_0)}{v_{0,1}(Q_0)} = \frac{m}{n}.$$

In this section we start with P_0, Q_0 and we apply successively two types of operations to the resulting Jacobian pairs:

- add constants or multiply by non-zero constants,
- apply automorphisms of L or $L^{(1)}$.

Using this method, we obtain $P_6, Q_6 \in L$, satisfying

$$\ell_{1,0}(P_6) = x^3y, \quad \ell_{1,0}(Q_6) = x^2y \quad \text{and} \quad [P_6, Q_6] = x^4y + \mu_3x^3 + \mu_2x^2 + \mu_1x + \mu_0$$

for some μ_0, μ_1, μ_2, μ_3 in K, with $\mu_0 \neq 0$.

Proposition 8.1. *Consider $\varphi_1 \in \mathrm{Aut}(L^{(1)})$ given by $\varphi_1(x) := x$ and $\varphi_1(y) := y + \lambda_1 x^{-2}$. Set $P_1 := \varphi_1(P_0)$ and $Q_1 := \varphi_1(Q_0)$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Dir}(P_1) = \mathrm{Dir}(Q_1) = \{(-1,4),(-1,2),(0,-1),(1,-3)\}.$$

We also have

$$\ell_{-1,4}(P_1) = \ell_{-1,4}(P_0), \quad \ell_{-1,4}(Q_1) = \ell_{-1,4}(Q_0), \quad v_{1,-3}(P_1) = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad v_{1,-3}(Q_1) = 0.$$

Moreover,

$$v_{1,1}(P_1) = v_{1,1}(P), \quad v_{1,1}(Q_1) = v_{1,1}(Q) \quad \textit{and} \quad [P_1, Q_1] \in K^\times.$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.8 we know that

$$\ell_{-1,4}(P_1) = \ell_{-1,4}(P_0), \quad \ell_{-1,4}(Q_1) = \ell_{-1,4}(Q_0), \quad v_{1,1}(P_1) = v_{1,1}(P), \quad \text{and} \quad v_{1,1}(Q_1) = v_{1,1}(Q).$$

We also have $\ell_{-1,2}(P_0) = \mu y^m$ for some $\mu \in K^\times$, since

$$\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{-1,2}(P_0) = \mathrm{st}_{-1,0}(P_0) = \mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(P_0) = m\,\mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(R_0) = m(0,1),$$

by Proposition 3.6. Again by Proposition 3.8,

$$\ell_{-1,2}(P_1) = \ell_{-1,2}(\varphi_1(P_0)) = \varphi_1(\ell_{-1,2}(P_0)) = \mu(y + \lambda_1 x^{-2})^m,$$



FIGURE 5. Proposition 8.1 for $m = 4$ and $n = 3$.

so $(-1, 4), (-1, 2)$ are consecutive elements of $\mathrm{Dir}(P_1)$. Since $(0, 0) \in \mathrm{Supp}(P_1)$ the next direction in $\mathrm{Dir}(P)$ is $(0, -1)$. By the same argument, $(-1, 4), (-1, 2)$ and $(0, -1)$ are consecutive directions of $\mathrm{Dir}(Q_1)$. Note also that $[P, Q] \in K^\times$ by Proposition 3.9. In order to finish the proof it suffices to verify that

$$\mathrm{Pred}_{P_1}(-1, 4) \leq (1, -3) < (-1, 4). \tag{8.1}$$

In fact, since $v_{1,-3}(\mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(P_1)) = 0$ and $(0, 0) \in \mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{0,-1}(P_1))$, in this case

- $v_{1,-3}(P_1) = 0$,
- $(0, 0) = \mathrm{st}_{1,-3}(P_1) = \mathrm{en}_{0,-1}(P_1)$,
- $(1, -3) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P_1)$,

from which it follows that $(0,-1)$ and $(1,-3)$ are consecutive directions in $\mathrm{Dir}(P_1)$, and these facts are also true for Q_1 by the same arguments.

Now we prove (8.1). Since

$$\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{1,-2}(P_1)) = \mathrm{Supp}(\varphi_1(\ell_{1,-2}(P_0))) = \mathrm{Supp}(\varphi_1(\lambda_P R_1^{4m})) = \mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(P_1),$$

where the first equality follows from Proposition 3.8, we are reduced to prove that

$$\mathrm{Pred}_{P_1}(-1,4) \notin](1,-3),(1,-2)[. \tag{8.2}$$

Assume by contradiction that $(\rho',\sigma') := \mathrm{Pred}_{P_1}(-1,4) \in](1,-3),(1,-2)[$. Then $v_{\rho,\sigma}(P_1) > 0$ for all $(\rho',\sigma') \leq (\rho,\sigma) < (-1,4)$.[36] The $(-1,4)$-homogeneous element F_1 of Theorem 2.6 satisfies

$$\mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(F_1) = (9,3) = \frac{3}{4}\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(P_1).^{[37]}$$

Then, by Corollary 7.4, we have $\ell_{\rho',\sigma'}(P_1) = \zeta R^{4m}$ for some (ρ',σ')-homogeneous element R and some $\zeta \in K^\times$. Since $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P_1) = m(12,4)$, we know that $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(R) = (3,1)$. By Remark 1.8,

$$v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(R)) < v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(R)) = 1,$$

and so $\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(R) = (k,0)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Again by Remark 1.8 we have

$$k = v_{1,-2}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(R)) < v_{1,-2}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(R)) = 1,$$

and

$$k = v_{1,-3}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(R)) > v_{1,-3}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(R)) = 0,$$

which yields the desired contradiction, proving (8.2) and concluding the proof. □

Proposition 8.2. *Let $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}_{>0}$ with $\rho < 0$ and let $P,Q \in L^{(1)}$ such that $[P,Q] \in K^\times$. Assume*

$$\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \frac{1}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = (a,b),$$

with $a,b,m,n \in \mathbb{N}$, $a > b$, $m \neq n$ and $\gcd(m,n) = 1$. Set

$$(\rho',\sigma') := \min\{\mathrm{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma), \mathrm{Succ}_Q(\rho,\sigma)\} \quad \text{and} \quad (a',b') := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P).$$

The following facts hold:

(1) *If $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q)$, then $(\rho',\sigma') \in \mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q)$. Furthermore*

$$(a',b') \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0, \quad v_{\rho,\sigma}(a',b') < v_{\rho,\sigma}(a,b) \quad \text{and} \quad ab' - ba' > 0. \tag{8.3}$$

(2) *If $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) \nsim \mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q)$, then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that*

$$(k+1)b < a \qquad \text{and} \qquad \{\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P), \mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q)\} = \{(-k,0),(k+1,1)\}.$$

(3) *If $(\rho,\sigma) = (-1,4)$, $(a,b) = (8,3)$ and $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q)$, then $(\rho',\sigma') = (-1,3)$ and there exist $\mu,\mu_P,\mu_Q \in K^\times$ such that*

$$\ell_{-1,3}(P) = \mu_P x^{-m}(x^3y - \mu)^{3m} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{-1,3}(Q) = \mu_Q x^{-n}(x^3y - \mu)^{3n}.$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.6, we know that

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = m(a,b) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = \frac{m}{n}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q), \tag{8.4}$$

which implies

$$v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = \frac{m}{n} v_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q). \tag{8.5}$$

Moreover, $(\rho',\sigma') \in \mathfrak{V}_{>0}$, since $(\rho',\sigma') \geq (-1,1) > (\rho,\sigma)$ is impossible because it implies

$$v_{-1,1}(P) = m(b-a) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_{-1,1}(Q) = n(b-a) < 0,$$

which contradicts Proposition 1.13. This same proposition yields

$$\frac{m+n}{m}v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) + v_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q) \geq v_{\rho',\sigma'}([P,Q]) + \rho' + \sigma' > 0.$$

So, by (8.4) and (8.5),

$$v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) > 0, \quad v_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho' a + \sigma' b = v_{\rho',\sigma'}(a,b) > 0. \tag{8.6}$$

Note also that

$$\rho < 0 \Leftrightarrow (-1,1) > (\rho,\sigma) > (0,1) \Rightarrow (-1,1) > (\rho',\sigma') > (0,1) \Rightarrow \rho' < 0.$$

Set

$$(\rho_1,\sigma_1) := \operatorname{dir}(a,b) = \left(-\frac{b}{\gcd(a,b)}, \frac{a}{\gcd(a,b)}\right).$$

Then

$$\rho'\sigma_1 - \sigma'\rho_1 = \frac{1}{\gcd(a,b)}(\rho' a + \sigma' b) > 0,$$

which means $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) > (\rho',\sigma')$ in $\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$. But then by the fact that $\operatorname{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = \operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = m(a,b)$ and Remark 1.8,

$$v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) > v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) = m v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(a,b) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q)) > 0. \tag{8.7}$$

Proof of statement (1). Since by (8.6) we have $v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) \neq 0$, it follows from equality (8.5), that

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = \lambda \operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q) \Longrightarrow \lambda = m/n. \tag{8.8}$$

So, by (8.4),

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = \operatorname{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q) = \operatorname{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q).$$

By the definition of (ρ',σ') this implies that

$$(\rho',\sigma') \in \operatorname{Dir}(P) \cap \operatorname{Dir}(Q).$$

Furthermore, since m and n are coprime, it follows from (8.8), that

$$(a',b') := \frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = \frac{1}{n}\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Using now Remark 1.8, we obtain

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(a',b') = \frac{1}{m}v_{\rho,\sigma}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) < \frac{1}{m}v_{\rho,\sigma}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) = \frac{1}{m}v_{\rho,\sigma}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(a,b).$$

Finally, by the definition of (ρ_1,σ_1) and the first inequality in (8.7),

$$ab' - ba' = \gcd(a,b)v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(a',b') = \frac{\gcd(a,b)}{m}v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) > 0.$$

Proof of statement (2). By the hypothesis and Proposition 2.3, we have

$$[\ell_{\rho',\sigma'}(P), \ell_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q)] \neq 0.$$

Hence, by Proposition 1.13,

$$[\ell_{\rho',\sigma'}(P), \ell_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q)] = \ell_{\rho',\sigma'}([P,Q]),$$

which, by Proposition 2.4(2), implies that

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) + \operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q) - (1,1) = \operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}\big([P,Q]\big) = (0,0).$$

Thus

$$\{\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P), \operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q)\} = \{(-k,0),(k+1,1)\} \quad \text{for some } k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Note that by (8.6)

$$0 < v_{\rho',\sigma'}(-k,0) = -k\rho',$$

which implies that $k \in \mathbb{N}$, since $\rho' < 0$. Finally, by the definition of (ρ_1, σ_1) and (8.7) we have

$$\frac{-b(k+1)+a}{\gcd(a,b)} = v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(k+1,1) > 0,$$

and so $(k+1)b < a$.

Proof of statement (3). We first prove that $(\rho', \sigma') = (-1, 3)$. By statement (1) we know that

$$(\rho', \sigma') = \mathrm{Succ}_P(\rho, \sigma) \qquad \text{and} \qquad (a', b') := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Hence, since $(\rho', \sigma') > (0, 1)$ in $\mathfrak{V}_{>0}$, from Remark 1.8 and Proposition 3.6 it follows that

$$b' = \frac{1}{m} v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) < \frac{1}{m} v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)) = \frac{1}{m} v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = 3.$$

Furthermore, by the inequalities in (8.3), and the fact that $(\rho, \sigma) = (-1, 4)$ and $(a, b) = (8, 3)$, we have

$$8b' - 3a' > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad 4 > 4b' - a'. \tag{8.9}$$

Now we consider several cases. In all of them we will use that, by Remark 3.2,

$$(\rho', \sigma') = \mathrm{dir}\big(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) - \mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)\big) = \mathrm{dir}\big((a, b) - (a', b')\big) = \mathrm{dir}\big((8, 3) - (a', b')\big).$$

If $b' = 2$, then the inequalities in (8.9) imply $4 < a' < 16/3$, and so

$$a' = 5 \qquad \text{and} \qquad (\rho', \sigma') = \mathrm{dir}\big((8, 3) - (5, 2)\big) = (-1, 3),$$

as desired. If $b' = 1$, then the inequalities in (8.9) imply $0 < a' < 8/3$. Since by Theorem 2.6(4), the equality $(a', b') = (1, 1)$ is impossible, necessarily $a' = 2$ and $(\rho', \sigma') = (-1, 3)$, again as desired. Assume finally that $b' = 0$. Then the inequalities in (8.9) give $-4 < a' < 0$. If $a' = -1$ then $(\rho', \sigma') = (-1, 3)$ as we want. So, it will be sufficient to discard the cases $a' = -2$ and $a' = -3$. Consider the first one, in which $(\rho', \sigma') = (-3, 10)$. By Theorem 2.6 there exists a (ρ', σ')-homogeneous element $F \in L^{(1)}$ satisfying the equalities (2.7), with (ρ, σ) replaced by (ρ', σ'). Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(F) = (1, 1) + k(10, 3),$$

and hence $v_{-3,8}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(F)) = 5 - 6k \neq 0$. Consequently

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(F) \sim \mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) = m(8, 3)$$

is impossible, since it implies $v_{-3,8}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(F)) = 0$. So, by statement (2) of Theorem 2.6, we have $\mathrm{st}_{\rho',\sigma'}(F) = (1, 1)$. Since by Remark 2.5 we know that F is not a monomial, $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(F) \neq (1, 1)$, which by Theorem 2.6(3) implies

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(F) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P) \sim (-1, 0).$$

But by the first equality in (2.7), this leads to $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(F) = (-7/3, 0)$, which is impossible. A similar computation proves that if $a' = -3$, then $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(F) = (-8/3, 0)$, which is also impossible. Thus, $(\rho', \sigma') = (-1, 3)$ as we want.

It remains to check that there exist $\mu, \mu_P, \mu_Q \in K^\times$ such that

$$\ell_{-1,3}(P) = \mu_P x^{-m}(x^3 y - \mu)^{3m} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{-1,3}(Q) = \mu_Q x^{-n}(x^3 y - \mu)^{3n}.$$

By equalities (8.4) we have

$$v_{-1,3}(P) = m v_{-1,3}(8, 3) = m > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{-1,3}(Q) = n v_{-1,3}(8, 3) = n > 0.$$

Since $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \neq n$ this implies that,

$$v_{-1,3}(P) + v_{-1,3}(Q) - (-1 + 3) = m + n - 2 > 0,$$

and so, by Proposition 1.13 and Remark 3.1, there exist $\lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in K^\times$ and a $(-1,3)$-homogeneous element $R \in L^{(1)}$ such that

$$\ell_{-1,3}(P) = \lambda_P R^m \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{-1,3}(Q) = \lambda_Q R^n. \tag{8.10}$$

Moreover, again by equalities (8.4),

$$\mathrm{st}_{-1,3}(R) = \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{-1,3}(P) = (8,3).$$

Whence there exists a polynomial $\mathfrak{r}$ of degree 3 such that

$$R = x^{-1}\mathfrak{r}(z) \quad \text{where } z := x^3 y.$$

We are going to check that $\mathfrak{r}$ has no linear factor $z-\mu$ with multiplicity 1, which implies that $\mathfrak{r}$ is a cube of a linear polynomial, and so $\ell_{-1,3}(P)$ and $\ell_{-1,3}(Q)$ have the desired form. Assume by contradiction that such a factor exists and consider the automorphism $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(L^{(1)})$ defined by

$$\varphi(x) := x \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varphi(y) := y + \mu x^{-3}.$$

Write $R = x^{-1}(z-\mu)\mathfrak{h}(z)$ with $\mathfrak{h}(\mu) \neq 0$. Then $\varphi(R) = x^{-1} z \mathfrak{h}(z+\mu)$ and so $\mathrm{en}_{-1,3}(\varphi(R)) = (2,1)$. Hence

$$\mathrm{en}_{-1,3}(\varphi(P)) = m(2,1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{-1,3}(\varphi(Q)) = n(2,1).$$

Set

$$(\rho'', \sigma'') := \min\{\mathrm{Succ}_{\varphi(P)}(-1,3), \mathrm{Succ}_{\varphi(Q)}(-1,3)\} \quad \text{and} \quad (a'', b'') := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(P)).$$

Since by Proposition 3.9 we have $[\varphi(P), \varphi(Q)] \in K^\times$, we can apply statements (1) and (2) with

$$(\varphi(P), \varphi(Q)) \text{ instead of } (P,Q), \quad (\rho,\sigma) := (-1,3) \quad \text{and} \quad (a,b) := (2,1).$$

So, if $\mathrm{en}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(P)) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(Q))$, then by statement (1) we have

$$(a'', b'') \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0, \quad 3b'' - a'' = v_{-1,3}(a'', b'') < v_{-1,3}(2,1) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 2b'' - a'' > 0,$$

which is impossible, while if $\mathrm{en}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(P)) \nsim \mathrm{en}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(Q))$, then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$k+1 < 2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \{\mathrm{en}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(P)), \mathrm{en}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi(Q))\} = \{(-k,0), (k+1,1)\},$$

which is also impossible since there is no $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k+1 < 2$. Hence we have a contradiction that finishes the proof. □

Proposition 8.3. *Let $P, Q \in L^{(1)}$ be such that $\frac{v_{1,1}(P)}{v_{1,1}(Q)} = \frac{m}{n} \neq 1$ with $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ coprime. Assume that*

$$[P,Q] \in K^\times, \quad v_{1,-3}(P) = v_{1,-3}(Q) = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{Succ}_P(1,-3) = \mathrm{Succ}_Q(1,-3) = (-1,4).$$

Assume also that there exist $\lambda, \lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in K^\times$ such that $R := y(x^4 y - \lambda)^3$ satisfies

$$\ell_{-1,4}(P) = \lambda_P R^m \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \ell_{-1,4}(Q) = \lambda_Q R^n.$$

Then there exists $\mu \in K$ such that the images $\widetilde{P} := \varphi(P)$ and $\widetilde{Q} := \varphi(Q)$ of P and Q under the automorphism φ of $L^{(1)}$ given by $\varphi(x) := x$ and $\varphi(y) := y + \lambda x^{-4} + \mu x^{-3}$, satisfy

$$\ell_{-1,4}(\widetilde{P}) = \lambda_P x^{8m} y^{3m} (x^4 y + \lambda)^m, \quad \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(\widetilde{P}) = (8,3), \quad v_{1,1}(\widetilde{P}) = v_{1,1}(P), \quad v_{1,-3}(\widetilde{P}) = 0,$$

$$\ell_{-1,4}(\widetilde{Q}) = \lambda_Q x^{8n} y^{3n} (x^4 y + \lambda)^n, \quad \frac{1}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(\widetilde{Q}) = (8,3), \quad v_{1,1}(\widetilde{Q}) = v_{1,1}(Q), \quad v_{1,-3}(\widetilde{Q}) = 0,$$

$$\mathrm{Succ}_{\widetilde{P}}(-1,4) = \mathrm{Succ}_{\widetilde{Q}}(-1,4), \qquad [\widetilde{P}, \widetilde{Q}] \in K^\times \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{P}) \nsim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{Q}),$$

where $(\rho,\sigma) := \mathrm{Succ}_{\widetilde{P}}(-1,4)$. Moreover

$$\{\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{P}), \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{Q})\} = \{(-1,0), (2,1)\}, \quad \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{P}) = m(8,3), \quad \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{Q}) = n(8,3)$$

and there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $(\rho, \sigma) = (-3j-1, 8j+3)$ *and*

- *if* $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{P}) = (-1, 0)$, *then* $m = 3j+1$ *and* $n = 2j+1$,
- *if* $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{Q}) = (-1, 0)$, *then* $m = 2j+1$ *and* $n = 3j+1$.

Idea of the proof: Using the automorphism φ_a of $L^{(1)}$ defined by

$$\varphi_a(x) := x \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varphi_a(y) := y + \lambda x^{-4},$$

we transform $\ell_{-1,4}(P) = \lambda_P(y(x^4y - \lambda)^3)^m$ into $\ell_{-1,4}(\varphi_a(P)) = \lambda_P x^{8m} y^{3m}(x^4y + \lambda)^m$. By Proposition 8.2 we have $(\rho, \sigma) = (-1, 3)$ or $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}\varphi_a(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi_a(Q))] \neq 0$. In the first case we apply the automorphism φ_b of $L^{(1)}$ defined by

$$\varphi_b(x) := x \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varphi_b(y) := y + \mu x^{-3},$$

for some $\mu \in K^\times$ and we arrive at the second case. Using Proposition 8.2 again, we check the required conditions.

Proof. We define $\varphi_a \in \operatorname{Aut}(L^{(1)})$ by $\varphi_a(x) := x$ and $\varphi_a(y) := y + \lambda x^{-4}$. Set

$$P_1 := \varphi_a(P) \qquad \text{and} \qquad Q_1 := \varphi_a(Q).$$

By Proposition 3.9 we have $[P_1, Q_1] \in K^\times$. Moreover, since φ_a is $(-1, 4)$-homogeneous,

$$\ell_{-1,4}(P_1) = \lambda_P x^{8m} y^{3m}(x^4y + \lambda)^m \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{-1,4}(Q_1) = \lambda_Q x^{8n} y^{3n}(x^4y + \lambda)^n, \tag{8.11}$$

and so

$$\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{-1,4}(P_1) = \frac{1}{n}\operatorname{en}_{-1,4}(Q_1) = (8, 3). \tag{8.12}$$

Furthermore, since $(1, -4) < (1, -3) < (-1, 4)$, it follows from Proposition 3.8 and the hypothesis, that

$$v_{1,-3}(P_1) = v_{1,-3}(P) = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{1,-3}(Q_1) = v_{1,-3}(Q) = 0. \tag{8.13}$$

Let

$$(\rho', \sigma') := \min\{\operatorname{Succ}_{P_1}(-1, 4), \operatorname{Succ}_{Q_1}(-1, 4)\}.$$

Applying Proposition 8.2(3) to (P_1, Q_1) we obtain that

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P_1) \nsim \operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q_1) \tag{8.14}$$

or

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P_1) \sim \operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(Q_1) \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho', \sigma') = (-1, 3). \tag{8.15}$$

Furthermore, in the second case there exist $\mu, \mu_P, \mu_Q \in K^\times$ such that

$$\ell_{-1,3}(P_1) = \mu_P x^{-m}(yx^3 - \mu)^{3m} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{-1,3}(Q_1) = \mu_Q x^{-n}(yx^3 - \mu)^{3n}. \tag{8.16}$$

Assume first that condition (8.15) is satisfied and define $\varphi_b \in \operatorname{Aut}(L^{(1)})$ by

$$\varphi_b(x) := x \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_b(y) := y + \mu x^{-3}.$$

By Proposition 3.9, we have $[\varphi_b(P_1), \varphi_b(Q_1)] \in K^\times$ and, by Proposition 3.8, we have

$$\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi_b(P_1)) = \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi_b(Q_1)) = \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q_1)$$

for all $(-1, 4) \leq (\rho_1, \sigma_1) < (-1, 3)$, which implies that

$$\ell_{-1,4}(\varphi_b(P_1)) = \ell_{-1,4}(P_1), \qquad \ell_{-1,4}(\varphi_b(Q_1)) = \ell_{-1,4}(Q_1) \tag{8.17}$$

and

$$(\rho'', \sigma'') := \min\{\operatorname{Succ}_{\varphi_b(P_1)}(-1, 4), \operatorname{Succ}_{\varphi_b(Q_1)}(-1, 4)\} \geq (-1, 3).$$

But, since φ_b is $(-1, 3)$-homogeneous it follows from equalities (8.16), that

$$\ell_{-1,3}(\varphi_b(P_1)) = \mu_P x^{8m} y^{3m} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{-1,3}(\varphi_b(Q_1)) = \mu_Q x^{8n} y^{3n},$$

and so $(\rho'',\sigma'') > (-1,3)$. Consequently, applying Proposition 8.2(3) to $(\varphi_b(P_1),\varphi_b(Q_1))$, we obtain that

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi_b(P_1)) \nsim \mathrm{en}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(\varphi_b(Q_1)).$$

Moreover, by Proposition 3.8 and equalities (8.13), we have

$$v_{1,-3}(\varphi_b(P_1)) = v_{1,-3}(P_1) = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{1,-3}(\varphi_b(Q_1)) = v_{1,-3}(Q_1) = 0.$$

Note also that combining equalities (8.11) and (8.17) we obtain

$$\ell_{-1,4}(\varphi_b(P_1)) = \lambda_P x^{8m} y^{3m} (x^4y+\lambda)^m \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{-1,4}(\varphi_b(Q_1)) = \lambda_Q x^{8n} y^{3n} (x^4y+\lambda)^n,$$

which implies

$$\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(\varphi_b(P_1)) = \frac{1}{n}\,\mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(\varphi_b(Q_1)) = (8,3). \tag{8.18}$$

Now in the case (8.14) we set

$$\varphi := \varphi_a, \quad \widetilde{P} := P_1, \quad \widetilde{Q} := Q_1 \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho,\sigma) := (\rho',\sigma'),$$

while in the case (8.15) we set

$$\varphi := \varphi_b \circ \varphi_a, \quad \widetilde{P} := \varphi_b(P_1), \quad \widetilde{Q} := \varphi_b(Q_1) \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho,\sigma) := (\rho'',\sigma'').$$

The conditions of Proposition 8.2 are satisfied for $\widetilde{P}$ and $\widetilde{Q}$. Moreover $\mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(\widetilde{P}) \nsim \mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(\widetilde{Q})$. Since $k=1$ is the unique positive integer satisfying $(k+1)3<8$, Proposition 8.2(2) yields

$$\{\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{P}), \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{Q})\} = \{(-1,0),(2,1)\}. \tag{8.19}$$

On the other hand, since $(\rho,\sigma) = \min\{\mathrm{Succ}_{\widetilde{P}}(-1,4), \mathrm{Succ}_{\widetilde{Q}}(-1,4)\}$, by Proposition 3.6 and equalities (8.12) and (8.18), we have

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{P}) = \mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(\widetilde{P}) = m(8,3) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{Q}) = \mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(\widetilde{Q}) = n(8,3). \tag{8.20}$$

Combining (8.19) and (8.20), we obtain that $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P) \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q)$, and then

$$(\rho,\sigma) = \mathrm{Succ}_{\widetilde{P}}(-1,4) = \mathrm{Succ}_{\widetilde{Q}}(-1,4),$$

as desired. Since $(1,-4) < (1,1) < (-1,4)$ and $(1,-3) < (1,1) < (-1,3)$, from Proposition 3.8 it follows that

$$v_{1,1}(\widetilde{P}) = v_{1,1}(P) \quad \text{and} \quad v_{1,1}(\widetilde{Q}) = v_{1,1}(Q).$$

Now, by Remark 3.2 and equalities (8.20), we have

$$\mathrm{dir}(n(8,3) - \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{Q})) = (\rho,\sigma) = \mathrm{dir}(m(8,3) - \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{P})).$$

If $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{P}) = (-1,0)$, then

$$m(8,3) - (-1,0) \sim n(8,3) - (2,1) \Rightarrow (8m+1)(3n-1) = 3m(8n-2) \Rightarrow 3(n-1) = 2(m-1),$$

and so $m=3j+1$ and $n=2j+1$ for some $j\in\mathbb{Z}$. But necessarily $j\in\mathbb{N}$ since $m,n\in\mathbb{N}$ and $m\neq n$. Moreover

$$(\rho,\sigma) = \mathrm{dir}((3j+1)(8,3) - (-1,0)) = \mathrm{dir}(24j+9, 9j+3) = (-3j-1, 8j+3).$$

Similarly, if $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\widetilde{Q}) = (-1,0)$, then $m=2j+1$ and $n=3j+1$ for some $j\in\mathbb{N}$, and

$$(\rho,\sigma) = \mathrm{dir}((3j+1)(8,3) - (-1,0)) = (-3j-1, 8j+3),$$

as desired. □

Remark 8.4. Let (P_0,Q_0), m and n be as at the beginning of the section. Applying first Proposition 8.1 to (P_0,Q_0) we obtain (P_1,Q_1), and then applying Proposition 8.3 to (P_1,Q_1), we obtain $j\in\mathbb{N}$, $\lambda,\lambda_p,\lambda_q\in K^\times$, $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) > (-1,4)$ and a pair $P_2,Q_2\in L^{(1)}$ such that

- $m = 3j+1$ and $n = 2j+1$,

- $\frac{v_{1,1}(P_2)}{v_{1,1}(Q_2)} = \frac{m}{n}$,
- $v_{1,-3}(P_2) = 0$ and $v_{1,-3}(Q_2) = 0$,
- $[P_2, Q_2] \in K^\times$,
- $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = \mathrm{Succ}_{P_2}(-1, 4) = \mathrm{Succ}_{Q_2}(-1, 4)$,
- $\mathrm{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P_2) = (-1, 0)$ and $\mathrm{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q_2) = (2, 1)$,
- $\mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P_2) = m(8, 3)$ and $\mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q_2) = n(8, 3)$,
- $\ell_{-1,4}(P_2) = \lambda_p R^m$ and $\ell_{-1,4}(Q_2) = \lambda_q R^n$ where $R := x^8y^3(x^4y + \lambda)$,
- $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = (-3j - 1, 8j + 3)$,
- $\mathrm{H}(P_2) = \mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{Supp}(P_2)) = \mathrm{CH}\{(-1, 0), m(8, 3), m(12, 4), (0, 0)\}$,
- $\mathrm{H}(Q_2) = \mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{Supp}(Q_2)) = \mathrm{CH}\{(2, 1), n(8, 3), n(12, 4), (0, 0)\}$,

where, as in Section 1, $\mathrm{H}(P)$ denotes the Newton polygon of P and for each subset X of $\mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathrm{CH}(X)$ denotes the convex hull of X. Note that $(-1, 2) > (\rho_1, \sigma_1)$, since $2\rho_1 + \sigma_1 = 2j + 1 > 0$. We will use this properties without further mention.



FIGURE 6. Proposition 8.6 for $m = 4$ and $n = 3$.

Remark 8.5. Let $\widetilde{\psi}_3$ be the $\mathbb{R}$-linear automorphism of $\mathbb{R}^2$ given by $\widetilde{\psi}_3(i, j) := (-i + 3j, j)$. If ψ_3 is the map given by $x \mapsto x^{-1}$ and $y \mapsto x^3y$, then

$$\psi_3\left(\sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}x^iy^j\right) = \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}x^{-i+3j}y^j,$$

and so $\mathrm{Supp}(\psi_3(P)) = \widetilde{\psi}_3(\mathrm{Supp}(P))$ for all $P \in L^{(1)}$. Moreover, since $\widetilde{\psi}_3$ is $\mathbb{R}$-linear, it preserves convex hulls, which means

$$\mathrm{CH}(\widetilde{\psi}_3(X)) = \widetilde{\psi}_3(\mathrm{CH}(X)),$$

for all sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$. In particular, for $A_1, \ldots, A_k \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $P \in L^{(1)}$,

$$\mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{Supp}(P)) = \mathrm{CH}\{A_1, \ldots, A_k\} \Longrightarrow \mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{Supp}(\psi_3(P))) = \mathrm{CH}\{\widetilde{\psi}_3(A_1), \ldots, \widetilde{\psi}_3(A_k)\}. \quad (8.21)$$

An elementary computation also shows that for $\overline{\psi}_3 : \mathfrak{V} \to \mathfrak{V}$ given by $\overline{\psi}_3(\rho, \sigma) = (-\rho, 3\rho + \sigma)$, we have

$$\ell_{\overline{\psi}_3(\rho,\sigma)}(\psi_3(P)) = \psi_3(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \quad \text{and} \quad v_{\overline{\psi}_3(\rho,\sigma)}(\psi_3(P)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \quad (8.22)$$

for all $P \in L^{(1)}$ and $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{V}$.

Proposition 8.6. *Let ψ_3 and $\overline{\psi}_3$ be as above. Set*

$$P_3 := \psi_3(P_2), \quad Q_3 := \psi_3(Q_2) \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho_2, \sigma_2) := \overline{\psi}_3(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = (-\rho_1, 3\rho_1 + \sigma_1) = (3j+1, -j).$$

The following facts hold:

(1) $P_3, Q_3 \in L$,
(2) $[P_3, Q_3] = \zeta x$, *for some* $\zeta \in K^\times$,
(3) $\mathrm{en}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(P_3) = m(1,3)$ *and* $\mathrm{en}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(Q_3) = n(1,3)$,
(4) $\mathrm{st}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(P_3) = (1,0)$ *and* $\mathrm{st}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(Q_3) = (1,1)$,
(5) $\{(\rho_2, \sigma_2), (1,1)\} \subseteq \mathrm{Dir}(P_3) \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q_3)$ *and* $(\rho_2, \sigma_2) = \mathrm{Pred}_{P_3}(1,1) = \mathrm{Pred}_{Q_3}(1,1)$,
(6) $\ell_{1,1}(P_3) = \lambda_p R_3^m$ *and* $\ell_{1,1}(Q_3) = \lambda_q R_3^n$, *where* $R_3 = y^3(y + \lambda x)$, *with* $\lambda, \lambda_p, \lambda_q \in K^\times$ *the same elements as in Remark 8.4.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.9 we have

$$[P_3, Q_3] = \psi_3([P_2, Q_2])[\psi_3(x), \psi_3(y)] = \zeta x \quad \text{for some } \zeta \in K^\times.$$

Next we are going to check that $P_3, Q_3 \in L$, or, equivalently, that

$$v_{-1,0}(P_3) \le 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{-1,0}(Q_3) \le 0. \tag{8.23}$$

Since $\overline{\psi}_3(1,-3) = (-1,0)$, these inequalities follow from (8.22) and the fact that $v_{1,-3}(P_2) = 0$ and $v_{1,-3}(Q_2) = 0$. Furthermore, since $\widetilde{\psi}_3$ is a reflection, consecutive elements of $\mathrm{Dir}(P)$ are mapped into consecutive elements of $\mathrm{Dir}(\psi_3(P))$, inverting the order. From

$$(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = \mathrm{Succ}_{P_2}(-1,4) = \mathrm{Succ}_{Q_2}(-1,4)$$

it follows that

$$(\rho_2, \sigma_2), (1,1) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P_3) \cap \mathrm{Dir}(Q_3) \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho_2, \sigma_2) = \mathrm{Pred}_{P_3}(1,1) = \mathrm{Pred}_{Q_3}(1,1),$$

since $(\rho_2, \sigma_2) = \overline{\psi}_3(\rho_1, \sigma_1)$ and $(1,1) = \overline{\psi}_3(-1,4)$.

Let $\widetilde{\psi}_3$ be as in Remark 8.5. Since

$$\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(\psi_3(P))) = \mathrm{Supp}(\psi_3(\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P))) = \widetilde{\psi}_3(\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P))) \qquad \text{for all } P \in L^{(1)},$$

and $\widetilde{\psi}_3$ is a reflection, we have

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(\psi_3(P)) = \widetilde{\psi}_3(\mathrm{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(\psi_3(P)) = \widetilde{\psi}_3(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P)), \qquad \text{for all } P \in L^{(1)}.$$

From this the third and fourth statements follow immediately. By (8.22) we also have

$$\ell_{1,1}\big(\psi_3(P_2)\big) = \psi_3\big(\ell_{1,-4}(P_2)\big) = \psi_3(\lambda_p R^m) = \lambda_p \psi_3(R^m) = \lambda_p R_3^m,$$

and similarly $\ell_{1,1}\big(\psi_3(Q_2)\big) = \lambda_q R_3^n$. □

Remark 8.7. We assert that

$$(-1,1) \le \mathrm{Pred}_{P_3}(\rho_2, \sigma_2) \le (1,-1) \quad \text{and} \quad (-1,1) \le \mathrm{Pred}_{Q_3}(\rho_2, \sigma_2) \le (1,-1). \tag{8.24}$$

Assume on the contrary that $(\overline{\rho}, \overline{\sigma}) := \mathrm{Pred}_{P_3}(\rho_2, \sigma_2) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P_3) \cap \mathfrak{V}_{>0}$. Then, since

$$(\overline{\rho}, \overline{\sigma}) < (\rho_2, \sigma_2) = (3j+1, -j) < (0,1),$$

using Remark 1.8, Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 8.6(4), we obtain that

$$v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(P_3)) < v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(P_3)) = v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(P_3)) = v_{0,1}(1,0) = 0,$$

which is a contradiction. On the other hand, if $(\overline{\rho}, \overline{\sigma}) := \mathrm{Pred}_{Q_3}(\rho_2, \sigma_2) \in \mathrm{Dir}(Q_3) \cap \mathfrak{V}_{>0}$, then again by Remark 1.8, Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 8.6(4), we have

$$v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(Q_3)) < v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(Q_3)) = v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(Q_3)) = v_{0,1}(1,1) = 1,$$

and similarly $v_{1,0}(\mathrm{st}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(Q_3)) < 1$, which implies $\mathrm{st}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(Q_3) = (-k, 0)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. So

$$v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(Q_3)) = -k \leq 0 = v_{1,-1}(1,1) = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(Q_3)) = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}}(Q_3)),$$

also a contradiction by Remark 1.8, which proves (8.24).

Remark 8.8. Combining (8.24) with Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 8.6(4), we obtain

$$\mathrm{en}_{1,-1}(P_3) = (1,0) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{en}_{1,-1}(Q_3) = (1,1),$$

since $(1,-1) < (\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ in $\mathfrak{V}_{\geq 0}$. Clearly this implies

$$\ell_{1,-1}(P_3) = \mu_P x \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{1,-1}(Q_3) = \mu_Q xy + \xi$$

with $\mu_P, \mu_Q \in K^\times$ and $\xi \in K$. Since by Proposition 1.13 and Proposition 8.6(2)

$$\mu_P \mu_Q x = [\mu_P x, \mu_Q xy + \xi] = [\ell_{1,-1}(P_3), \ell_{1,-1}(Q_3)] = -\zeta x,$$

dividing P_3 by μ_P and replacing Q_3 by $\frac{\mu_P}{\zeta}(Q_3 - \xi)$, we obtain a new Jacobian pair (P_4, Q_4) satisfying statements (1)–(6) of Proposition 8.6, and such that

$$\ell_{1,-1}(P_4) = x \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{1,-1}(Q_4) = -xy.$$

Proposition 8.9. *Let $\psi_1 \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ be the map given by $\psi_1(x) = y$ and $\psi_1(y) = -x$ and $\overline{\psi}_1$ be the action on directions given by $\overline{\psi}_1(\rho, \sigma) = (\sigma, \rho)$. Let P_4, Q_4 be as in Remark 8.8 and λ be as in Proposition 8.6. Set $(\rho_3, \sigma_3) := \overline{\psi}_1(\rho_2, \sigma_2) = (\sigma_2, \rho_2) = (-j, 3j+1)$. There exist $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3 \in K$ such that the images $P_5 := \varphi(\psi_1(P_4))$ and $Q_5 := \varphi(\psi_1(Q_4))$ of $\psi_1(P_4)$ and $\psi_1(Q_4)$ under the automorphism φ of $L^{(1)}$ given by*

$$\varphi(x) := x \quad \textit{and} \quad \varphi(y) := y + \mu_0 x + \mu_1 + \mu_2 x^{-1} + \mu_3 x^{-2},$$

where $\mu_0 := 1/\lambda$, satisfy:

1. $(-\rho_3, -\sigma_3) \leq \mathrm{Pred}_{P_5}(\rho_3, \sigma_3), \mathrm{Pred}_{Q_5}(\rho_3, \sigma_3) \leq (1, -3)$,
2. $\mathrm{en}_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(P_5) = (0,1)$, $\mathrm{en}_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(Q_5) = (1,1)$, $\mathrm{st}_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(P_5) = m(3,1)$ *and* $\mathrm{st}_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(Q_5) = n(3,1)$.
3. $\mathrm{en}_{1,-3}(P_5)) = m(3,1)$ *and* $\mathrm{en}_{1,-3}(Q_5)) = n(3,1)$,
4. $[P_5, Q_5] = -(y + \mu_0 x + \mu_1 + \mu_2 x^{-1} + \mu_3 x^{-2})$,
5. $\ell_{-1,2}(P_5) = y + \mu_3 x^{-2}$ *and* $\ell_{-1,2}(Q_5) = xy + \mu_3 x^{-1}$.

Idea of the proof: We map successively $y \mapsto y + \mu_0 x$, then $y \mapsto y + \mu_1$, then $y \mapsto y + \mu_2 x^{-1}$ and finally $y \mapsto y + \mu_3 x^{-2}$, transforming $\mathrm{Pred}(\rho_3, \sigma_3)$ from $(1,1)$ to $(1,0)$, then to $(1,-1)$, $(1,-2)$ and finally to $(1,-3)$ or lower. Then P_5 and Q_5 are as in figure 7 and we verify the other conditions.

Proof. We assert the following: If $P, Q \in L^{(1)}$ satisfy

a) $\ell_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(P) = \ell_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(\psi_1(P_4))$ and $\ell_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(Q) = \ell_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(\psi_1(Q_4))$,
b) $(1,-3) < (\rho, \sigma) \leq (1,1)$ for $(\rho, \sigma) := \max\{\mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_3, \sigma_3), \mathrm{Pred}_Q(\rho_3, \sigma_3)\}$,
c) $v_{\rho,\sigma}([P,Q]) \leq v_{\rho,\sigma}(x+y)$,

then there exists $R \in L^{(1)}$ and $\lambda_p, \lambda_q \in K^\times$, such that

1. $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \lambda_p R^m$ and $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = \lambda_q R^n$,
2. $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R) = (3,1)$ and $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(R) = (k,0)$ for some $k = 1, 2, 3$ or 4,
3. $(\rho, \sigma) = (1, k-3)$,
4. $R = x^3(y - \mu_{4-k} x^{k-3})$ for some $\mu_j \in K^\times$.

Note that $\mathrm{en}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(P_4) = m(1,3)$ implies $\mathrm{st}_{\sigma_2,\rho_2}(\psi_1(P_4)) = m(3,1)$. Hence, by a), b) and Proposition 3.6, we have

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{\sigma_2,\rho_2}(\psi_1(P_4)) = m(3,1). \tag{8.25}$$

On the other hand, from b) it follows that $3\rho+\sigma > 0$ and $\rho \geq \sigma$, and therefore

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = mv_{\rho,\sigma}(3,1) = m(3\rho+\sigma) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = n(3\rho+\sigma) > 0.$$

Then, since $\rho > 0$,

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) - (\rho+\sigma) = (m+n-1)(3\rho+\sigma) + 2\rho > \rho = v_{\rho,\sigma}(x+y) \geq v_{\rho,\sigma}([P,Q]),$$

and so, by Proposition 1.13, we deduce that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = 0$. Thus statement (1) follows from Remark 3.1. Equality (8.25) implies $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R) = (3,1)$. So, since $(0,-1) > (\rho,\sigma) > (0,1)$, by Remark 1.8, we have

$$v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(R)) > v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R)) = -1,$$

which yields $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(R) = (k,0)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $(\rho,\sigma) = \pm(1,k-3)$, and using again Remark 1.8 and the inequalities $(0,-1) > (\rho,\sigma) > (0,1)$, we obtain that $(\rho,\sigma) = (1,k-3)$. Now, by statement (b) we have $(1,-3) < (\rho,\sigma) \leq (1,1)$, which gives $k = 1,2,3$ or 4, completing statement (2), from which statement (4) follows directly.

Now we will construct inductively the automorphism φ. By Proposition 8.6(6), we know that there exist $\lambda, \lambda_p, \lambda_q \in K^\times$ such that

$$\ell_{1,1}(P_4) = \lambda_p R_3^m \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{1,1}(Q_4) = \lambda_q R_3^n,$$

where $R_3 := y^3(y+\lambda x)$. Hence

$$\ell_{1,1}(\psi_1(P_4)) = \psi_1(\ell_{1,1}(P_4)) = \lambda_p \psi_1(R_3)^m = \widetilde{\lambda}_p x^{3m}(y-\mu_0 x)^m \tag{8.26}$$

and

$$\ell_{1,1}(\psi_1(Q_4)) = \psi_1(\ell_{1,1}(Q_4)) = \lambda_q \psi_1(R_3)^n = \widetilde{\lambda}_q x^{3n}(y-\mu_0 x)^n \tag{8.27}$$

where $\lambda_{\widetilde{P}} := -\lambda_P \lambda$, $\lambda_{\widetilde{Q}} := -\lambda_Q \lambda$ and $\mu_0 := \lambda^{-1}$ (we can apply ψ_1 to P_4 and Q_4 by Proposition 8.6). Now set

$$\widetilde{P}_1 := \varphi_0(\psi_1(P_4)), \quad \widetilde{Q}_1 := \varphi_0(\psi_1(Q_4)) \quad \text{and} \quad (\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}) := \max\big(\mathrm{Pred}_{\widetilde{P}_1}(\rho_3,\sigma_3), \mathrm{Pred}_{\widetilde{Q}_1}(\rho_3,\sigma_3)\big),$$

where φ_0 is the automorphism of L defined by

$$\varphi_0(x) := x \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varphi_0(y) := y + \mu_0 x.$$

By Proposition 3.8, we have

$$\ell_{\rho',\sigma'}(\widetilde{P}_1) = \ell_{\rho',\sigma'}(\psi_1(P_4)) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{\rho',\sigma'}(\widetilde{Q}_1) = \ell_{\rho',\sigma'}(\psi_1(Q_4)) \tag{8.28}$$

for all $(1,1) < (\rho',\sigma') \leq (-1,-1)$, and so, by Proposition 8.6(5),

$$(\rho_3,\sigma_3) = \mathrm{Succ}_{\widetilde{P}_1}(1,1) = \mathrm{Succ}_{\widetilde{Q}_1}(1,1),$$

since ψ_1 acts as a reflection on the support. Consequently $(-\rho_3,-\sigma_3) \leq (\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}) \leq (1,1)$. But, since by equalities (8.26) and (8.27)

$$\ell_{1,1}(\widetilde{P}_1) = \ell_{1,1}(\varphi_0(\psi_1(P_4))) = \varphi_0(\ell_{1,1}(\psi_1(P_4))) = \widetilde{\lambda}_p x^{3m}\varphi_0(y-\mu_0 x)^m = \widetilde{\lambda}_p x^{3m} y^m \tag{8.29}$$

and

$$\ell_{1,1}(\widetilde{Q}_1) = \ell_{1,1}(\varphi_0(\psi_1(Q_4))) = \varphi_0(\ell_{1,1}(\psi_1(Q_4))) = \widetilde{\lambda}_q x^{3n}\varphi_0(y-\mu_0 x)^n = \widetilde{\lambda}_q x^{3n} y^n, \tag{8.30}$$

we have $(\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}) < (1,1)$. By Proposition 3.9 we also have $[\widetilde{P}_1, \widetilde{Q}_1] = -(y+\mu_0 x)$. If

$$(-\rho_3,-\sigma_3) < (\overline{\rho},\overline{\sigma}) \leq (1,-3),$$

then we set $\varphi := \varphi_1$ and $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 := 0$, and we verify the required conditions.

Else $\widetilde{P}_1$, $\widetilde{Q}_1$ satisfy the conditions a), b) and c). Hence, $\mathrm{Pred}_{\widetilde{P}_1}(1,1) \in \{(1,-2),(1,-1),(1,0)\}$, and using the automorphism φ_2 defined by $\varphi_2(x) := x$ and $\varphi_2(y) := y + \mu_1$ we obtain by the same arguments as before $\widetilde{P}_2 := \varphi_2(\widetilde{P}_1)$, $\widetilde{Q}_2 := \varphi_2(\widetilde{Q}_1)$ satisfying either the conditions of the Proposition, or the conditions a), b) and c) with $\mathrm{Pred}_{\widetilde{P}_2}(1,1) \in \{(1,-2),(1,-1)\}$. Then we get $\widetilde{P}_4$, $\widetilde{Q}_4$ satisfying either the conditions of the Proposition, or the conditions a), b) and c) with $\mathrm{Pred}_{\widetilde{P}_4}(1,1) = (1,-2)$. Finally we obtain $\widetilde{P}_5$, $\widetilde{Q}_5$ satisfying the conditions of the Proposition. □



FIGURE 7. Illustration of Proposition 8.10, for $j = 1$.

Proposition 8.10. *Let ψ_3 be as in Remark 8.5. Define $P_6 := \psi_3(P_5)$ and $Q_6 := \psi_3(Q_5)$. Then:*

(1) $\mathrm{Dir}(P_6) \cap \mathfrak{V}_{>0} = \mathrm{Dir}(Q_6) \cap \mathfrak{V}_{>0} = \{(j,1)\}$, *where $m = 3j+1$ and $n = 2j+1$,*
(2) $\mathrm{st}_{j,1}(P_6) = (3,1)$, $\mathrm{st}_{j,1}(Q_6) = (2,1)$, $\mathrm{en}_{j,1}(P_6) = (0,m)$ *and* $\mathrm{en}_{j,1}(Q_6) = (0,n)$,
(3) $P_6, Q_6 \in L$,
(4) $\ell_{1,-1}(P_6) = x^3y + \mu_3x^2$ *and* $\ell_{1,-1}(Q_6) = x^2y + \mu_3x$,
(5) $[P_6, Q_6] = x^4y + \mu_0 + \mu_1x + \mu_2x^2 + \mu_3x^3$,

where $\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3$ are as in the previous proposition.

Proof. We use the same notations as in Proposition 8.6. Recall that $(\rho_3, \sigma_3) = (-j, 3j+1)$ with $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $\overline{\psi}_3(\rho_3, \sigma_3) = (j,1)$. Note that, by Remark 8.5,

$$\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{j,1}(\psi_3(P))) = \mathrm{Supp}(\psi_3(\ell_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(P))) = \widetilde{\psi}_3(\mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(P))) \qquad \text{for all } P \in L^{(1)}.$$

Hence

$$\mathrm{st}_{j,1}(\psi_3(P)) = \widetilde{\psi}_3(\mathrm{en}_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(P)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{j,1}(\psi_3(P)) = \widetilde{\psi}_3(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_3,\sigma_3}(P)) \qquad \text{for all } P \in L^{(1)}.$$

By Proposition 8.9(2), applying this equality with $P = P_5$ and $P = Q_5$ we get statement (2). Using Proposition 8.9(3) and arguing as in the proof of Proposition 8.6(1) we obtain statement (3). Statement (4) follows from Proposition 8.9(5). Next we prove statement (1). Note that by statements (2) and (4)

$$\mathrm{en}_{1,-1}(P_6) = \mathrm{st}_{j,1}(P_6) \neq \mathrm{en}_{j,1}(P_6) = (0,m) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{1,-1}(Q_6) = \mathrm{st}_{j,1}(Q_6) \neq \mathrm{en}_{j,1}(Q_6) = (0,n),$$

and so, by Proposition 3.7 we have $\mathrm{Dir}(P_6) \cap \mathfrak{V}_{>0} = \mathrm{Dir}(Q_6) \cap \mathfrak{V}_{>0} = \{(j,1)\}$, as desired. Finally, statement (5) follows from Propositions 3.9 and 8.9(4). □

Resuming the main results in this section we have arrived at the following theorem:

Theorem 8.11. *If $B = 16$, then there exist $P_6, Q_6 \in L$ and $\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3 \in K$ with $\mu_0 \neq 0$ such that*

$$\ell_{1,-1}(P_6) = x^3y + \mu_3 x^2, \quad \ell_{1,-1}(Q_6) = x^2y + \mu_3 x \quad \textit{and} \quad [P_6, Q_6] = x^4y + \mu_0 + \mu_1 x + \mu_2 x^2 + \mu_3 x^3.$$

Furthermore, if P, Q is a minimal pair that is an (m, n)-pair, with $m > n$, then $m = 3j + 1$ and $n = 2j + 1$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover we can choose P_6, Q_6 in such a way that

$$\mathrm{Dir}(P_6) \cap \mathfrak{V}_{>0} = \mathrm{Dir}(Q_6) \cap \mathfrak{V}_{>0} = \{(j, 1)\},$$

and the starting and end points satisfy

$$\mathrm{st}_{j,1}(P_6) = (3, 1), \quad \mathrm{st}_{j,1}(Q_6) = (2, 1), \quad \mathrm{en}_{j,1}(P_6) = (0, m) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{en}_{j,1}(Q_6) = (0, n).$$

Remark 8.12. In this last section we have managed to reduce the degrees of P, Q from $16m, 16n$ to m, n. The first step, reduction of degrees to $4m, 4n$, was done in Proposition 8.6 and it is the algebraic process that correspond to the reduction done by Moh in the case $m = 3, n = 4$ using [12, Propositions 6.3 and 6.4]. It is based on Corollary 7.4 and the fact that $b = q$, where $(a/l, b) := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{st}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)$ and $\mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(F) = \frac{p}{q}(a/l, b)$. In fact, Corollary 7.4 allows us to write $\ell_{1,-2}(P)$ as a mq-th power of a linear polynomial R, and $b = q$ allows to "cut" the support until $v_{1,-3}(P_1) = 0$ and $v_{1,-3}(Q_1) = 0$. This correspond geometrically to squeeze the support in order to obtain the following form:



FIGURE 8. $v_{1,-3}(P_1) = 0$.

This figure is the same as Figure 11 in [3, page 2779]. But in cases different of $16m, 16n$ this cannot always be obtained. For instance, consider the example of Remark 2.7:

$$P = x^2y + x^6y^2(1 + 6x^2y + 9x^4y^2)$$

and

$$Q = x^{-1} + x^3y(2 + 18x^2y + 36x^4y^2) + x^9y^3(8 + 72x^2y + 216x^4y^2 + 216x^6y^3).$$

Here $[P, Q] = 1$, $m = 2$, $n = 3$, $b = 4$ and $q = 2$, so Corollary 7.4 applies. In order to obtain the desired squeezing we need $\ell_{-1,2}(P) = \lambda_p x^2(x^2y - \lambda)^4$ for some $\lambda, \lambda_p \in K^\times$ but this cannot be achieved.

Acknowledgment We wish to thank the referee for useful comments and suggestions that helped us to reduce the size of the paper and improve the presentation. We also thank Leonid Makar-Limanov for the argument in the proof of Proposition 4.5.

Notes

[1] In the case in which P is (ρ,σ)-homogeneous but is not a monomial this definition is a little confusing. Remark 1.7 clarify this situation.

[2] This property, combined with the fact that $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ and $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ are the end points of $H(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P))$, determines $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ and $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$.

[3] By Proposition 1.13 we know that $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(R)=\ell_{\rho,\sigma}([P,Q])$.

[4] Write $F=\lambda x^{\frac{a}{l}}y^b$ and $P=x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p(z)$ with

$$\lambda\in K^\times,\qquad p(0)\neq 0\qquad\text{and}\qquad z:=\begin{cases}x^{-\sigma/\rho}y & \text{if } \rho\neq 0,\\ x^{1/l} & \text{if } \rho=0.\end{cases}$$

Clearly

$$\mathrm{Supp}(P)=\mathrm{Supp}([F,P])\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(P)+\Big(\frac{a}{l},b\Big)-(1,1),$$

and so $\mathrm{Supp}(F)=(1,1)$. Hence $F=\lambda xy$ with $\lambda\in K^\times$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p(z)&=\big[\lambda xy,x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p(z)\big]\\&=\lambda x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s[xy,p(z)]+\lambda\big[xy,x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s\big]p(z)\\&=\lambda x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p'(z)[xy,z]+\lambda\Big(s-\frac{r}{l}\Big)x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p(z)\\&=\lambda v_{-1,1}(z)x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p'(z)z+\lambda\Big(s-\frac{r}{l}\Big)x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p(z),\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$p(z)=\lambda\Big(v_{-1,1}(z)p'(z)z+\Big(s-\frac{r}{l}\Big)p(z)\Big).$$

Hence $p(z)\mid v_{-1,1}(z)p'(z)z$, and so, if P is not a monomial, then $v_{-1,1}(z)=0$, from which $\rho+\sigma=0$ follows.

[5] By Lemma 2.2 we know that $[[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)],\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]=0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)][F,\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]&=[[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]F,\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]\\&=[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0)\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]\\&=[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P),\end{aligned}$$

which implies $[F,\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]=\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ because $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(G_0),\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]\neq 0$. Moreover, by Proposition 1.13,

$$[F,\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]=\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)\Longrightarrow v_{\rho,\sigma}(F)=\rho+\sigma.$$

Finally, statement (5) is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.2.

[6] Assume on the contrary that there exists $F\in L^{(1)}$ such that

$$[F,\ell_{1,-2}(P)]=\ell_{1,-2}(P).$$

Replacing F with $\ell_{1,-2}(F)$ we can assume that F is $(1,-2)$-homogeneous. If $\mathrm{st}_{1,-2}(F)\sim\mathrm{st}_{1,-2}(P)=(6,2)$, then $\mathrm{st}_{1,-2}(F)=\lambda(3,1)$ for some $\lambda\in K$. But by Proposition 1.13 we know that $v_{1,-2}(F)=-1$ and so $\lambda=-1$ which is impossible, since $\mathrm{st}_{1,-2}(F)\in\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{N}_0$. Hence, by Theorem 2.6(2), we have $\mathrm{st}_{1,-2}(F)=(1,1)$. The same argument shows that $\mathrm{en}_{1,-2}(F)=(1,1)$. But then F is a monomial, which contradicts Remark 2.5.

[7] Note that if P is a monomial, then $\mathrm{Dir}(P)=\emptyset$ and that if P is (ρ,σ)-homogeneous, but is not a monomial, then $\mathrm{Dir}(P)=\{(\rho,\sigma),(-\rho,-\sigma)\}$

[8] The complete computation is

$$\begin{aligned}[F,\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)]&=\big[x^{\frac{u}{l}}y^v f(z),x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s p(z)\big]\\&=\big[x^{\frac{u}{l}}y^v,x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s\big]f(z)p(z)+x^{\frac{u}{l}}y^v\big[f(z),x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s\big]p(z)+x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s\big[x^{\frac{u}{l}}y^v,p(z)\big]f(z)\\&=\big[x^{\frac{u}{l}}y^v,x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s\big]f(z)p(z)+x^{\frac{u}{l}}y^v\big[z,x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s\big]f'(z)p(z)+x^{\frac{r}{l}}y^s\big[x^{\frac{u}{l}}y^v,z\big]f(z)p'(z)\\&=x^{\frac{u+r}{l}-1}y^{v+s-1}\big(cf(z)p(z)+azf(z)p'(z)-bzf'(z)p(z)\big).\end{aligned}$$

[9] This follows from the following easy lemma.

Lemma A.1. *Let $(\rho,\sigma)\in\mathfrak{V}$ with $\rho\neq 0$ and let $p,g\in K[z]$ with $z:=x^{-\sigma/\rho}y$. If $p(0)\neq 0$ and there are $l\in\mathbb{N}$, $b,d\in\mathbb{N}_0$ and $a,c\in\mathbb{Z}$ such that*

$$x^{\frac{a}{l}}y^b p(z)=x^{\frac{c}{l}}y^d g(z),$$

then there exists $h\in\mathbb{N}_0$ such that $z^h p(z)=g(z)$.

Proof. Write $g(z) = z^h\overline{g}(z)$, with $\overline{g}(0) \neq 0$. Comparing in the equality $x^{\frac{a}{t}}y^b p(z) = x^{\frac{c}{t}}y^d z^h \overline{g}(z)$ the monomials with lowest y-degree, we obtain $x^{\frac{a}{t}}y^b = x^{\frac{c}{t}}y^d z^h$. Consequently $p(z) = \overline{g}(z)$, as desired. □

[10]Note that $\mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho,\sigma) \neq \mathrm{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma)$ except in the case in which P is (ρ,σ)-homogeneous. In this case

$$\mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho,\sigma) = \mathrm{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma) = (-\rho,-\sigma).$$

[11]In fact, from

$$\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}\big(\varphi(x^{\frac{i}{t}}y^j)\big) = x^{\frac{i}{t}}y^j \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } j \in \mathbb{N},$$

it follows that

$$\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}\big(\varphi(P)\big) = P \quad \text{for all } (\rho_1,\sigma_1)\text{-homogeneous } P \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\} \tag{A.1}$$

and

$$v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi(R)) = v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(R) \quad \text{for all } R \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\}. \tag{A.2}$$

Fix now $P \in L^{(l)} \setminus \{0\}$ and write

$$P = \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P) + R \quad \text{with } R = 0 \text{ or } v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(R) < v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P).$$

Applying first equality (A.2) and then equality (A.1), we obtain

$$\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi(P)) = \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi(\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P))) = \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P),$$

as desired.

[12]Assume for example that $v_{1,1}(P)$ divides $v_{1,1}(Q)$. By Proposition 2.1(2), there exist $\lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in K^\times$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a $(1,1)$-homogeneous polynomial $R \in L$, such that

$$\ell_{1,1}(P) = \lambda_P R^m \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{1,1}(Q) = \lambda_Q R^n.$$

Since $v_{1,1}(P) \mid v_{1,1}(Q)$, we have $n = km$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence,

$$\ell_{1,1}(Q) = \ell_{1,1}\left(\frac{\lambda_Q}{\lambda_P^k}P^k\right),$$

and so $Q_1 := Q - \frac{\lambda_Q}{\lambda_P^k}P^k$ satisfies $v_{1,1}(Q_1) < v_{1,1}(Q)$. Moreover it is clear that $[P,Q_1] = [P,Q] \in K^\times$. Now we can construct successively $Q_2, Q_3, \ldots$, such that $[P,Q_k] \in K^\times$ and $v_{1,1}(Q_k) < v_{1,1}(Q_{k-1})$, until we obtain that $v_{1,1}(P)$ does not divide $v_{1,1}(Q_k)$. Then $B_1 := \gcd(v_{1,1}(Q_k), v_{1,1}(P)) < B$, which contradicts the minimality of B. Similarly $v_{1,1}(Q)$ divides $v_{1,1}(P)$ is impossible.

[13] We prove this only for P since the proof for Q is similar. Since $v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) \in -m\mathbb{N}_0$, it suffices to show that $v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) < 0$. But otherwise, $\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P) = (a,0)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Q}$, and so

$$v_{1,0}(P) = v_{1,0}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) < 0,$$

which is impossible since $v_{1,0}(P) > 0$.

[14] Let $(\overline{P},\overline{Q}) := (\varphi(P),\varphi(Q))$. It is enough to prove that there exists $\varphi' \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ such that

$$(-1,1) < \mathrm{Succ}_{\varphi'(\overline{P})}(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_{\varphi'(\overline{Q})}(1,0) < (-1,0), \tag{A.3}$$

and

$$(a,b) \in \mathrm{Supp}(\varphi'(\overline{P})) \subseteq \{(i,j) : 0 \le i \le a,\ 0 \le j \le b\}. \tag{A.4}$$

Let $\psi_1 \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ be the flip given by $\psi_1(x) := y$ and $\psi_1(y) := -x$. Define $P_1 := \psi_1(\overline{P})$ and $Q_1 := \psi_1(\overline{Q})$. In order to obtain (A.3) and (A.4) it suffices to show that there exists $\varphi_1' \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ such that

$$(0,-1) < \mathrm{Pred}_{\varphi_1'(P_1)}(0,1), \mathrm{Pred}_{\varphi_1'(Q_1)}(0,1) < (1,-1). \tag{A.5}$$

and

$$(b,a) \in \mathrm{Supp}(\varphi_1'(P_1)) \subseteq \{(i,j) : 0 \le i \le b,\ 0 \le j \le a\}. \tag{A.6}$$

In fact, these facts imply

$$(-1,1) < \mathrm{Succ}_{\psi_1(\varphi_1'(P_1))}(1,0), \mathrm{Succ}_{\psi_1(\varphi_1'(Q_1))}(1,0) < (-1,0),$$

and

$$(a,b) \in \mathrm{Supp}(\psi_1(\varphi_1'(P_1))) \subseteq \{(i,j) : 0 \le i \le a,\ 0 \le j \le b\}.$$

which allow us to take $\varphi' := \psi_1 \circ \varphi_1' \circ \psi_1$. Note that the Jacobian determinant of ψ_1 is 1, and so (P_1,Q_1) is a counterexample to JC. Moreover

$$(b,a) \in \mathrm{Supp}(P_1) \subseteq \{(i,j) : 0 \le i \le b,\ 0 \le j \le a\}.$$

Consequently, $\mathrm{en}_{P_1}(1,0) = (b,a) = \mathrm{st}_{P_1}(0,1)$ and so, by Proposition 3.7,

$$(0,-1) \le \mathrm{Pred}_{P_1}(0,1) \le (1,0).$$

Now we are going to prove that there exists $\varphi_1' \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ such that (A.6) is satisfied and

$$(0,-1) \leq \mathrm{Pred}_{\varphi_1'(P_1)}(0,1) < (1,0).$$

If $(0,-1) \leq \mathrm{Pred}_{P_1}(0,1) < (1,0)$, the we can take $\varphi_1' := \mathrm{id}$. So, we can assume that $\mathrm{Pred}_{P_1}(0,1) = (1,0)$. Since $v_{1,0}(P_1) = b > 0$, by Theorem 2.6 there exists a $(1,0)$-homogeneous polynomial F such that

$$v_{1,0}(F) = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad [F, \ell_{1,0}(P_1)] = \ell_{1,0}(P_1).$$

Moreover by item 3) of that theorem, we know that

$$\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(F) = (1,1) \qquad \text{or} \qquad \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(F) \sim \mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P_1) = (b,a).$$

On the other hand since $v_{1,0}(F) = 1$ and F is $(1,0)$-homogeneous, there exists a univariate polynomial $f \neq 0$ such that $F = xf(y)$, which implies that $\mathrm{Supp}(F) \subseteq \{(1,k) : k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. Consequently $\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(F) = (1,1)$, because $(1,k) \sim (b,a)$ is impossible since $b > a > 0$. By Remark 2.5 and Proposition 2.10(2) we know that $\mathrm{st}_{(1,0)}(F) = (1,0)$. Thus $F = \mu_F x(y-\lambda)$ for some $\mu_F, \lambda \in K^\times$. Therefore, by Proposition 2.10(1), there exists $\mu_{P_1} \in K^\times$ such that $\ell_{1,0}(P_1) = \mu_{P_1} x^b (y-\lambda)^a$. Let $\varphi_1' \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ be the automorphism defined by $\varphi_1'(x) := x$ and $\varphi_1'(y) := y + \lambda$. By Proposition 3.8,

$$\ell_{1,0}(\varphi_1'(P_1)) = \mu_{P_1} x^b y^a \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi_1'(P_1)) = \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P_1) \quad \text{for all } (1,0) < (\rho_1,\sigma_1) \leq (0,1).$$

So, (A.6) is satisfied and $(0,-1) \leq \mathrm{Pred}_{\varphi_1'(P_1)}(0,1) < (1,0)$. Combining this with Proposition 4.1 and Remark 3.1, we obtain that

$$\mathrm{Dir}(\varphi_1'(Q_1)) \cap [(1,0),(0,1)] = \mathrm{Dir}(\varphi_1'(P_1)) \cap [(1,0),(0,1)] = \emptyset,$$

and so $(0,-1) \leq \mathrm{Pred}_{\varphi_1'(Q_1)}(0,1) < (1,0)$. In order to finish the proof we must see that

$$\mathrm{Pred}_{\varphi_1'(P_1)}(0,1), \mathrm{Pred}_{\varphi_1'(Q_1)}(0,1) \notin [(1,-1),(1,0)[.$$

We will prove this only for $\varphi_1'(P_1)$ since the argument for $\varphi_1'(Q_1)$ is the same. By [4] it is impossible that $(\rho,\sigma) = (1,-1)$. Assume $(\rho,\sigma) \in](1,-1),(1,0)[$, which means that $\rho > -\sigma > 0$. Since

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi_1'(P_1)) \geq v_{\rho,\sigma}(b,a) = \rho b + \sigma a > (\rho+\sigma)a \geq \rho + \sigma > 0,$$

we can apply Theorem 2.6. Hence, there exist a (ρ,σ)-homogeneous polynomial F_1 such that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1) = \rho + \sigma$ and

$$(b,a) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi_1'(P_1)) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1) \qquad \text{or} \qquad \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1) = (1,1).$$

If $(b,a) \sim \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1)$, then there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1) = \lambda(b,a)$. So

$$\rho + \sigma = v_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1) = \rho\lambda b + \lambda\sigma a > \lambda a(\rho+\sigma) \Longrightarrow 0 < \lambda a < 1,$$

which is impossible, since $\lambda a = v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1)) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Consequently $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1) = (1,1)$. By Remarks 1.8 and 2.5, we have $v_{0,1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1)) < v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1)) = 1$. Therefore $\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1) = (k,0)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which leads to the contradiction $\rho + \sigma = v_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(F_1)) = \rho k \geq \rho > \rho + \sigma$, and finishes the proof.

[15] By (4.8), there exists $\lambda_Q \in K^\times$ such that $\ell_{1,1}(\overline{Q}) = \lambda_Q x^{n\bar{a}} y^{n\bar{b}}$, and

$$i \leq n\bar{a}, \quad j \leq n\bar{b} \quad \text{and} \quad i + j < n\bar{a} + n\bar{b} \qquad \text{for all } (i,j) \in \mathrm{Supp}(\overline{Q}) \setminus \{(n\bar{a}, n\bar{b})\}.$$

Thus, for all such (i,j), we have

$$v_{1,1}(\psi(x^i y^j)) = i v_{1,1}(R) + j v_{1,1}(R^k) < n\bar{a} v_{1,1}(R) + n\bar{b} v_{1,1}(R^k) = v_{1,1}(\psi(x^{n\bar{a}} y^{n\bar{b}})),$$

and so $v_{1,1}(\psi(\overline{Q})) = v_{1,1}(\psi(x^{n\bar{a}} y^{n\bar{b}})) = n v_{1,1}(R)(\bar{a} + k\bar{b})$.

[16] By Proposition 3.6 we know that $\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P)$. Hence

$$v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P)) = v_{0,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < -1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P)) = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < 0,$$

where for the first inequality we have used that $\frac{1}{m} v_{0,1}(\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) \geq 1$. Moreover it is clear that $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) \in \mathrm{Dir}(P)$. Hence, in order to finish the proof we only must show that $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) \in I$, which follows immediately since $(\rho,\sigma) \in I$ and, by hypothesis, $(\rho,\sigma) < (\rho_1,\sigma_1) \leq (1,0)$.

[17] If $(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$, then by items (1) and (3) of Proposition 5.4, we have

$$\mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \frac{m}{n} \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) \qquad \text{and} \qquad (\rho,\sigma) \in \mathrm{Dir}(Q).$$

Applying now Lema 5.1, we obtain

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) > 0.$$

Assume now that $(\rho,\sigma) = \mathrm{Pred}_P(\rho_1,\sigma_1)$. Then by Proposition 5.4,

$$(\rho,\sigma) = \mathrm{Pred}_Q(\rho_1,\sigma_1) \in \mathrm{Dir}(Q).$$

Moreover, by Propositions 3.6 and 5.4(2),

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \operatorname{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P) = \frac{m}{n}\operatorname{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q) = \frac{m}{n}\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q).$$

Finally, again by Lema 5.1,

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) > 0.$$

[18] Since $\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \operatorname{st}_{\operatorname{Succ}_P(1,0)}(P)$, by Proposition 3.7 we know that (ρ,σ) and $\operatorname{Succ}_P(1,0)$ are consecutive elements in $\operatorname{Dir}(P)$, and hence $\operatorname{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma) = \operatorname{Succ}_P(1,0)$.

[19] Since $(1,0) < (\rho_1',\sigma_1') \le \operatorname{Succ}_P(1,0)$, by Proposition 3.6

$$\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \operatorname{en}_{1,0}(P) = \operatorname{st}_{\rho_1',\sigma_1'}(P).$$

Hence, since $(\rho,\sigma) \in \operatorname{Dir}(P)$, from Proposition 3.7 it follows that $(\rho,\sigma) = \operatorname{Pred}_P(\rho_1',\sigma_1')$.

[20] Since $(1,-1) < (\rho,\sigma) \le (1,0)$, we have $\rho > 0$ and $\sigma \le 0$. Combining this with the facts that $b > 0$ and, by Corollary 5.7(1),

$$\rho\frac{a}{l} + \sigma b = v_{\rho,\sigma}(P) > 0,$$

we obtain $a > 0$.

[21] By item (1) of Proposition 5.4,

$$\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \in \frac{1}{l}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}_0.$$

On the other hand clearly $(\rho,\sigma) \in I$ and items (2) and (3) of Definition 5.5 are true. Moreover, since $(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$ and $\frac{\rho+\sigma}{\rho} > 0$, by equalities (2.8) we have

$$v_{0,-1}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < v_{0,-1}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < -1 \quad \text{and} \qquad v_{1,-1}(\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < v_{1,-1}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < 0,$$

which proves item (1). Now Lemma 5.1 proves that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] = 0$. Moreover, by the first equality in (2.8), we know that z is a factor of $\mathfrak{p}$, because $s > 0$. But $\mathfrak{p}$ is not a power of z, since $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)$ is not a monomial, and consequently, $\#\operatorname{factors}(\mathfrak{p}(z)) > 1$.

[22] Item (2) of Definition 5.5 is trivial and item (3) follows from Proposition 3.6. Now we prove item (1). If we set $\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = (a'/l, b')$, then $a'/l < b'$, since $\frac{1}{m}v_{1,-1}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) < 0$, and $b' > 0$, since otherwise we have $v_{\rho,\sigma}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = \rho a'/l < 0$, which contradicts Corollary 5.7(1). It remains to check that $(\rho',\sigma') \in I$. But this follows immediately from Proposition 5.4, since $(\rho,\sigma) \in A(P)$, because $v_{0,-1}(\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = -mb' < -1$.

[23] Assume first $(1,0) \in \operatorname{Dir}(P)$. In this case, using Remark 4.4, it is easy to check that $\big(\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{1,0}(P), (1,0)\big)$ is a regular corner. Suppose now $(1,0) \notin \operatorname{Dir}(P)$ and set $(\rho,\sigma) := \operatorname{Pred}_P(1,0)$. Since, by Proposition 3.6

$$\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \frac{1}{m}\operatorname{st}_{1,0}(P) = \frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{1,0}(P)$$

it is enough to show that $\big(\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P), (\rho,\sigma)\big)$ is a regular corner of (P,Q). If $A(P) = \emptyset$ then this follows from Remark 4.4 and the additional part of Propositions 5.4. Otherwise

$$(\rho,\sigma) = \max(\operatorname{Dir}(P) \cap I) = \max(A(P)),$$

where the last equality follows from Proposition 5.2. Remark 5.10 concludes the proof.

[24] Clearly items (1) and (2) of Definition 5.5 are fulfilled. So, we have to prove only that

$$\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(\varphi(P)) = (a/l, b) \qquad \text{and} \qquad (\rho',\sigma') \in I.$$

By Proposition 3.8,

$$\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \varphi\big(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P)\big) = \mu x^{\frac{k}{l}}\Big(x^{-\frac{\sigma}{\rho}}\big(y + \lambda x^{\frac{\sigma}{\rho}}\big) - \lambda\Big)^r = \mu x^{\frac{k}{l} - \frac{\sigma r}{\rho}} y^r,$$

and so, by Propositions 3.6 and 3.8,

$$\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(\varphi(P)) = \frac{1}{m}\operatorname{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = \frac{1}{m}\operatorname{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = (a/l, b),$$

as desired. It remains to verify that $(\rho',\sigma') \in I$. Since $(\rho',\sigma') = \operatorname{Pred}_{\varphi(P)}(\rho,\sigma) < (\rho,\sigma) \le (1,0)$ we have only to prove that $(1,-1) < \operatorname{Pred}_{\varphi(P)}(\rho,\sigma)$. Let $(\rho_2,\sigma_2) := \operatorname{Succ}_{\varphi(P)}(\rho,\sigma)$. By Proposition 5.4, in order to obtain this inequality it is enough to show that $(\rho_1,\sigma_1) \le (\rho_2,\sigma_2)$, where

$$(\rho_1,\sigma_1) := \begin{cases} \min\big(A(\varphi(P))\big) & \text{if } A(\varphi(P)) \neq \emptyset, \\ \min\big(\operatorname{Succ}_{\varphi(P)}(1,0), \operatorname{Succ}_{\varphi(Q)}(1,0)\big) & \text{if } A(\varphi(P)) = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

When $(\rho_2,\sigma_2) \notin I$ this is evident. Assume that $(\rho_2,\sigma_2) \in I$ and set $J := \{(\rho'',\sigma'') : (\rho,\sigma) < (\rho'',\sigma'') \le (-\rho,-\sigma)\}$. By Proposition 3.8,

$$(\rho_2,\sigma_2) = \operatorname{Succ}_{\varphi(P)}(\rho,\sigma) = \operatorname{Succ}_P(\rho,\sigma) \qquad \text{and} \qquad A(P) \cap J = A(\varphi(P)) \cap J,$$

while by Proposition 3.6

$$\mathrm{st}_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = m(a/l, b).$$

Consequently $(\rho_2, \sigma_2) \in A(P) \cap J \subseteq A(\varphi(P))$, and so $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \leq (\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ follows.

[25] By Remark 4.4 we know that $\frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0$. Moreover condition (3) of Definition 5.5 is trivially fulfilled and condition (2) holds because $v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) < 0$. It remains to prove that if $(a, b) := \frac{1}{m}\,\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)$, then $b > a$ and $b \geq 1$. But this follows from the fact that $a - b = v_{1,-1}(\mathrm{en}_{1,0}(P)) < 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{N}$.

[26] Write $\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = P_1^{m_1} \cdot \cdots \cdot P_r^{m_r}$ where the P_j's are irreducible. Let $d := \gcd(m_1, \ldots, m_r)$. Then we can take $R_0 := P_1^{m_1/d} \cdot \cdots \cdot P_r^{m_r/d}$.

[27] Replace R_0 by $R_0^{\gcd(u_0,u_1,u_2,u_3)}$.

[28] Write $(a/l, b) := \mathrm{st}_{\rho'',\sigma''}(P) = \mathrm{en}_{\rho',\sigma'}(P)$ and set

$$(\overline{\rho}, \overline{\sigma}) := \frac{1}{d}(lb, -a), \quad \text{where } d := \gcd(lb, a).$$

Then we have

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(a/l, b) > 0 \iff 0 < \rho\frac{a}{l} + \sigma b = \frac{d}{l}\left(\frac{bl}{d}, -\frac{a}{d}\right) \times (\rho, \sigma) = \frac{d}{l}(\overline{\rho}, \overline{\sigma}) \times (\rho, \sigma) \iff (\overline{\rho}, \overline{\sigma}) < (\rho, \sigma) < (-\overline{\rho}, -\overline{\sigma}).$$

Hence, if $v_{\rho',\sigma'}(P), v_{\rho'',\sigma''}(P) > 0$, then

$$(\overline{\rho}, \overline{\sigma}) < (\rho', \sigma') < (\rho'', \sigma'') < (-\overline{\rho}, -\overline{\sigma}),$$

from which the assertion follows.

[29] It is impossible that $(\rho'', \sigma'') = (\rho_0, \sigma_0)$ since by statements (1) and (4) of Proposition 5.17,

$$\mathrm{en}_{(\rho_0,\sigma_0)}(\varphi(P)) = \mathrm{en}_{(\rho_0,\sigma_0)}(P) = m(a/l, b) = \mathrm{st}_{(\rho_0,\sigma_0)}(\varphi(P)).$$

[30] By Theorem 2.6(1) and Remark 6.3 we know that $(A_0, (\rho_0, \sigma_0))$ is of type IIb).

[31] $\gcd(a_0, b_0) = 2$ implies $q_0 = 2$. In fact, since $F \in L$, by Theorem 7.6(2) we have $q_0 \mid \gcd(a_0, b_0) = 2$. But $q_0 = 1$ is impossible by Proposition 6.4(4).

[32] If $(-1, 0) < (\rho_1, \sigma_1) < (1, 0)$, then by Remark 1.8 and Proposition 3.6, we have

$$a = \frac{1}{m}v_{1,0}\big(\mathrm{en}_{\rho_0,\sigma_0}(P)\big) = \frac{1}{m}v_{1,0}\big(\mathrm{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P)\big) < \frac{1}{m}v_{1,0}\big(\mathrm{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P)\big) = a_1.$$

as desired. If $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = (1, 0)$, then trivially $a = a_1$.

[33] In fact, this implies $mA_0 \in \ell_{1,1}(P)$. Hence $mA_0 \in \mathrm{Supp}(\ell_{4,-1}(\ell_{1,1}(P)))$, because $mA_0 \in \ell_{4,-1}(P)$. Thus, by Remark 1.8 we have $\mathrm{en}_{4,-1}(P) = mA_0 = \mathrm{st}_{1,1}(P)$. Consequently, by Proposition 3.7, there is no direction in $\mathrm{Dir}(P)$ between $(4, -1)$ and $(1, 1)$. Similarly there is no direction in $\mathrm{Dir}(Q)$ between $(4, -1)$ and $(1, 1)$.

[34] Note that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathrm{en}_{4,-1}(P)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(m(4, 12)) > 0$ if and only if $(3, -1) < (\rho, \sigma) < (-3, 1)$.

[35] We apply Corollary 7.2 with $(\rho_0, \sigma_0) = (4, -1)$. Conditions (1) and (2) of this corollary follow from statements (1) and (2) of Corollary 5.7.

[36] Note that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(P)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(m(12, 4)) > 0$ if and only if $(1, -3) < (\rho, \sigma) < (-1, 3)$.

[37] We claim that $\mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(F_1) \sim \mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(P_1) = m(12, 4)$. If the claim is true, then $\mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(F_1) = \alpha(3, 1)$ and $\alpha = v_{-1,4}(F_1) = -1 + 4 = 3$ yields $\mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(F_1) = (9, 3)$, as desired.

If we assume by contradiction that $\mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(F_1) \nsim \mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(P_1)$, then $\mathrm{st}_{-1,4}(F_1) = (1, 1)$ by Theorem 2.6(2), and so, by Remark 2.5, we have $\mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(F_1) \neq (1, 1)$, which by Theorem 2.6(3) implies

$$\mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(F_1) \sim \mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(P_1) = (0, m).$$

But then $v_{-1,4}(F_1) = 3$ leads to $\mathrm{en}_{-1,4}(F_1) = (0, 3/4)$, a contradiction which proves the claim.

References

[1] S. S. Abhyankar, *Lectures on expansion techniques in algebraic geometry*, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Lectures on Mathematics and Physics, vol. 57, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, 1977. Notes by Balwant Singh. MR542446 (80m:14016)

[2] ———, *Some thoughts on the Jacobian Conjecture, Part II*, Journal of Algebra **319** (2008), 1154-1248.

[3] ———, *Some thoughts on the Jacobian Conjecture. III.*, Journal of Algebra **320** (2008), 2720-2826.

[4] Pierrette Cassou-Noguès, *Newton trees at infinity of algebraic curves*, Affine algebraic geometry, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, vol. 54, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011, pp. 1–19. MR2768630 (2012i:14034)

[5] Jacques Dixmier, *Sur les algèbres de Weyl*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **96** (1968), 209–242 (French). MR0242897 (39 #4224)

[6] Jorge A. Guccione, Juan J. Guccione, and Christian Valqui, *The Dixmier conjecture and the shape of possible counterexamples*, Journal of Algebra **399** (2014), 581-633.
[7] R. Heitmann, *On the Jacobian conjecture*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **64** (1990), 35–72. MR1055020 (91c :14018)
[8] A. Joseph, *The Weyl algebra – semisimple and nilpotent elements*, American Journal of Mathematics **97** (1975), 597–615. MR0379615 (52 :520)
[9] Heinrich W. E. Jung, *Über ganze birationale Transformationen der Ebene*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **184** (1942), 161–174 (German). MR0008915 (5,74f)
[10] Ott-Heinrich Keller, *Ganze Cremona-Transformationen*, Monatsh. Math. Phys. **47** (1939), no. 1, 299–306, DOI 10.1007/BF01695502 (German). MR1550818
[11] Jeffrey Lang, *Jacobian pairs. II*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **74** (1991), no. 1, 61–71, DOI 10.1016/0022-4049(91)90049-8. MR1129130 (92k:14015)
[12] T. T. Moh, *On the Jacobian conjecture and the configurations of roots*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **340** (1983), 140–212. MR691964 (84m:14018)
[13] Leonid Makar-Limanov, *On the Newton polygon of a Jacobian mate*, Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik Preprint Series 2013 (53).
[14] Arno van den Essen, *Polynomial automorphisms and the Jacobian conjecture*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 190, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2000. MR1790619 (2001j:14082)
[15] H. Zoladek, *An application of Newton-Puiseux charts to the Jacobian problem*, Topology **47** (2008), 431–469. MR2427734 (2009h :14108)

Departamento de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales-UBA, Pabellón 1-Ciudad Universitaria, Intendente Guiraldes 2160 (C1428EGA) Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Instituto de Investigaciones Matemáticas "Luis A. Santaló", Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales-UBA, Pabellón 1-Ciudad Universitaria, Intendente Guiraldes 2160 (C1428EGA) Buenos Aires, Argentina.
E-mail address: vander@dm.uba.ar

Departamento de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales-UBA, Pabellón 1-Ciudad Universitaria, Intendente Guiraldes 2160 (C1428EGA) Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Instituto Argentino de Matemática-CONICET, Saavedra 15 3er piso, (C1083ACA) Buenos Aires, Argentina.
E-mail address: jjgucci@dm.uba.ar

Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Sección Matemáticas, PUCP, Av. Universitaria 1801, San Miguel, Lima 32, Perú.

Instituto de Matemática y Ciencias Afines (IMCA) Calle Los Biólogos 245. Urb San César. La Molina, Lima 12, Perú.
E-mail address: cvalqui@pucp.edu.pe